

Alexander Taylor Cooper to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Ralph Ellis Murrell to be major, Medical Corps.

William Lawrence Kay, jr., to be captain, Field Artillery.

Harry Marten Schwarze to be captain, Field Artillery.

Philip Wallace Ricamore to be captain, Infantry.

Benjamin Kenney Erdman to be captain, Infantry.

Ridgely Gaither, jr., to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Earl William Aldrup to be first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps.

Conrad Gordon Follansbee to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

John Henry Sampson, jr., to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

George August Zeller to be first lieutenant, Ordnance Department.

August Edward Schanze to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Howard Eugene Engler to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

John Thomas Aydelotte to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Taylor Edwin Darby to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Charles Walter Haverkamp to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Milner Hubbard Eskew to be major, Medical Corps.

Herman James Lambert to be major, Dental Corps.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Paul N. Shailer, Chester.

DELAWARE

Howard Rash, Cheswold.

Lester A. Downham, Wyoming.

GEORGIA

John H. Hendrix, Hawkinsville.

ILLINOIS

Bernard A. Dorries, Breese.

Ancel R. Dion, Clifton.

Lillie M. Diver, Dallas City.

INDIANA

Joseph T. Nighbert, Hanover.

Fred McNutt, Waveland.

IOWA

Paul S. Junkin, Fairfield.

Ruby H. Beasley, Hamburg.

Mae C. Liebke, Letts.

Charles J. Rutenbeck, Lost Nation.

R. Earl Ferguson, Rolfe.

KANSAS

Frederick B. Larkin, Beattie.

Stephen T. Roach, Englewood.

Cyrus L. Ward, Narka.

LOUISIANA

Harry R. Mock, Baskin.

Reynald J. Patin, Breaux Bridge.

Levi P. Carter, Bunkie.

Russell A. Dilly, Clinton.

Annie M. Pyron, Collinston.

Victor E. Green, De Ridder.

Solomon C. Knight, Elizabeth.

Ella Farr, Gilliam.

Benjamin F. Cowley, Leesville.

Claud Jones, Longleaf.

John C. Yarbrough, Mansfield.

Leonard L. Thompson, Montgomery.

Thomas E. Barham, Oak Ridge.

Henry A. Donaldson, Reserve.

MAINE

Lincoln C. Bragdon, Franklin.

Charles E. Norton, York Beach.

MINNESOTA

Arlie R. Wilder, Amboy.

Alice G. Doherty, Byron.

William B. Heick, Calumet.

Emil A. Voelz, Danube.

Elmer C. Hutchinson, Eagle Bend.

Joseph Huelskamp, Gaylord.

Anna E. Miller, Kelliher.

Oliver A. Matson, Kiester.

William Pennar, Laporte.

Frank J. Machacek, Lonsdale.

Robert L. Bresnan, Madison Lake.

Wallace R. Ackerman, Mapleton.

Archie M. Hayes, McGregor.

John P. Keohen, Montgomery.

Gustave A. Krueger, Plummer.

Harry M. Logan, Royalton.

Walter W. Parish, Rushford.

Edgar A. Enders, Winnebago.

Charles Lindsay, Woodstock.

MISSOURI

Peter S. Rabenstein, Hayti.

Robert W. Evens, Herculanum.

John E. Thomas, Laredo.

Julius J. Boehmer, Lincoln.

Rachel Pinkley, Portageville.

Grace E. Kirkbride, Ravenwood.

NEVADA

Anne M. Holcomb, Battle Mountain.

OREGON

Carrie N. Parker, Gladstone.

Karl A. Bramwell, Halsey.

Polk E. Mays, Joseph.

Thomas J. Warren, McMinnville.

John H. Farrar, Salem.

PENNSYLVANIA

Albert S. Leiby, Bath.

J. Howard Gawthrop, Kennett Square.

Leon M. Cobb, Mount Pocono.

RHODE ISLAND

William L. Simonini, Conimicut.

Frank W. Crandall, Hope Valley.

Wilfred R. Easterbrooks, Wakefield.

UTAH

Clark Allred, Delta.

Julius S. Dalley, Kanab.

A. Morinda Lundberg, Sandy.

John E. Sheffer, Smithfield.

VIRGINIA

Mary P. Moon, Cartersville.

Stewart G. Baker, Chincoteague Island.

Anthony Hart, Clifton Station.

Thomas J. Nevitt, Colonial Beach.

Thomas C. Bunting, Exmore.

Harry A. Sager, Herndon.

Homo D. Gleason, Lovington.

James L. Earles, Willis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, May 20, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Praise ye the Lord, for He is good and His mercy endureth forever. As watchmen wait for the morning, so may we wait for Thee. Bring our souls into the mood of hoping and trusting in Thee, our Father. Unite joy and duty, privilege and responsibility, for we can not offer a more convincing testimony before the Republic. O that patriotism would walk at the side of intelligence, that it may not be blind. Bless our whole country and lead it to seek not only its own interests and aggrandizements but the universal good and peace of mankind. May all our free institutions be pleasing in Thy sight and be a living force among all nations. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9843. An act to enable the Secretary of War to accomplish the construction of approaches and surroundings, together with the necessary adjacent roadways, to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of medals to the officers and men of the Byrd Antarctic expedition.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of John Campbell Greenway, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 10813, entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. KENDRICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 7491, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes."

DONATIONS OF SITES FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on account of an emergency existing for the passage of such legislation I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the bill (H. R. 12343) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept donations of sites for public buildings, which is No. 548 on the Consent Calendar. The bill in all probability would not be reached to-day in the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, accept in behalf of the United States the donation of sites for public buildings, etc., in cases when allocation of funds have been or may hereafter be reported to Congress under the provisions of the public buildings act, approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof, notwithstanding that specific authorization for the acquisition of sites in such cases may not yet have been made by Congress.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I doubt the wisdom of a bill of this kind giving blanket authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to accept gifts of sites.

In the first place, it may have a tendency to disturb the priorities; and in the second place, it seems to me there is great danger that under such authority sites may be offered to develop certain sections of a town or a city, as the case may be. I believe that each case ought to be decided on its merits, and that the United States should not relinquish control.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from Indiana ought to make an explanation of what he has in view in offering the bill at this time, and why it should be considered now.

Mr. ELLIOTT. As I understand, the bill was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, at the request of some of the members of that committee for the following reasons: First, up at Wellsboro, Pa., in the district represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS], some gentleman willed to the Federal Government a valuable site in that city, and under the terms of the will the site will have to be accepted by the Federal Government on or before July 1, or it reverts to his estate. As I understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS] this is a very desirable site, and one that the people there want the Government to accept, and this is about the only way they can have it accepted.

I understand there are several other places in the country where they are offering to donate sites to the Federal Government. The question of whether the Secretary accepts them or not is left entirely to his discretion, and I presume they would not be accepted except where they were needed for the purpose which the Government has in view.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is here and can explain the matter further.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Would the acceptance of these sites change the priorities that would otherwise be followed in the building of public buildings?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it would be a very poor policy for the Government to give a city a building where a site was donated when another community might not get a building because the site was not donated.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not think this will affect the matter of priorities at all.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman will permit, let me say that I do not think the passage of this bill will have any such effect

as my friend from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] seems to fear. It will not give any city or any town anywhere in the United States preference in the consideration of sites and buildings by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I have been informed that the amount of authorization now unallocated will amount to something like \$110,000,000, which will doubtless be sufficient to erect a building within the next few years in all towns with receipts of over \$20,000.

This is the situation in which the Secretary of the Treasury finds himself. Under the law he can accept donations where Congress has actually acted and authorized a building and the acquisition of a site, but he can not accept a site under the law or under the rulings until Congress has taken such action. In other words, if a site is offered to be donated in a certain town or in a certain city, they can not accept it until they send up their allocations and Congress has specifically passed upon them. There are, I am told, something like 50 offers of this kind and it occurred to me it was a perfectly proper thing to authorize the Secretary to accept such donations of sites where there are no conditions attached or anything of that sort, because it would serve to increase the building fund.

This first came up in committee on a matter I was discussing and it was explained that the Secretary could not accept the site, as I have stated, in advance of action by the Congress. The matter then was taken up in committee and I do not think I am misstating their position in saying that the entire subcommittee, and there are several of them on the floor now, felt that this proposed legislation ought to be included in the deficiency bill if it were not subject to a point of order, and I made the statement in the hearing that upon my own responsibility I proposed to offer it on the floor, and it was at the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] that I introduced the bill and asked the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to act upon it and report it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. It seems to me that it is very poor policy for the Federal Government to be able to accept a donation, where two communities might be trying to get a Federal building, and one get ahead of the other by the donation of a site. If we could be assured that the Secretary of the Treasury will not in administering the law give consideration to a community on the basis of a donation of a site, and allow that community to get ahead of another that was not able or willing to donate a site, I would have no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. I have been assured by those who represent the Treasury Department that it will not have that effect; that it will not result in the slightest favoritism to the community that donates the site.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But it might favor one section of the city against another where the public building is to be erected. I think every case ought to be decided on its merits. If the gentleman wants to provide the authority for the Treasury to take advantage of the gift mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana, the bill can be amended to do that, but this bill is certainly too broad in its general policy.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not think it is. The discretion is left with the Secretary of the Treasury where the building is to be erected. If he does not think that the building should be erected in one portion of the city, the Secretary is not going to be swayed by the donation of a site. I do not think he would be guided by the fact that some part of the city or town offers a site in another portion of the town.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. He is bound to if he has only so much money for this project in a place.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me say that he already has authority now, after the appropriation is made, to accept the donation of a site, and every evil that the gentleman from New York conjures up might happen. This is to make it possible to expedite things; it is an emergency case that the gentleman from Indiana mentions where the gift will lapse if not accepted at a certain time. Let the Secretary of the Treasury accept the gift when the site appeals to him.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think it is most unbecoming in a democratic form of government where a man can donate a site and erect a monument to himself.

Mr. CRAMTON. He will not have any monument; his name will not appear on the site or the building. It has been done in dozens of cases where men have donated sites and nobody has had any monument erected to him.

Mr. BYRNS. As the gentleman from Michigan points out, the Secretary of the Treasury can accept a donation of a site after an appropriation is made. Take this case: Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury has \$125,000 for the acquisition of a site for a building. After Congress has acted on it, under the law he can accept the donation to which the gentleman from

New York objects. If it was probable that he would do what the gentleman from New York fears, he could then do that very thing. This simply provides that he may do in advance what he may do afterwards.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield? I do not know what the effect of this proposition will have on giving preference to one place over another for the construction of a Federal building. But it seems to me a little bit of strained policy for the Federal Government to begin to accept favoritism from individual places that desire public buildings. The situation is this: One place is equally meritorious with another, but one place is ready to give a site for a Federal building and they will say if you are ready, go ahead with the project immediately.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And the gentleman may add that this may be the first step toward putting up a building in a community in place of another community which can not afford to donate a site.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Let me say this: There is a lot of trouble that exists over the manner of getting these sites. I have noted cases where communities came crawling before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to get an authorization for a public building in their town and then, immediately upon the acceptance, proceeded to go out and try to hold the Government up to the last notch for a site. Here is a case where the community is just offering to give a desirable site to the Government, and it must meet with the approbation of the Secretary of the Treasury; and after the site has been accepted, then Congress has to pass upon the question of whether a building will be placed on that site; so that if there is any favoritism, the whole matter can be ironed out here in Congress when they come back asking for an appropriation of Federal funds to construct a building on this site.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, I am in thorough accord with the statement of the chairman of the committee. He has done a most valuable work for this country. He has met innumerable and almost insurmountable problems in getting this building program on foot. I have the greatest regard for his judgment in respect to matters of detail, but the compromising attitude in which we may place our departments in working on these particular items when it comes to considering a place that is offering a site and one that can not offer a site does not appeal to me. I know that there are instances where the building may be held up because a site is put up in price after the authorization is made, and that is something that has to be met. I am sure the gentleman has stated the situation correctly, but I do not like the idea of placing our Government in a position of holding out any sort of favorable consideration to a place that will give a site, any more than it does to a place that can not give a site.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I notice the bill uses the following language:

That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, accept in behalf of the United States the donation of sites for public buildings, and so forth.

What does "and so forth" mean? It is peculiar legislative language.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I shall ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to explain that.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, that language was furnished by those representing the Treasury Department, to meet the very situation that has been set forth here by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton].

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me it would be unusual indeed to enact a statute using such language.

Mr. BYRNS. I am willing to have that stricken out.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It is a wonder they did not put in the words "you know what I mean."

Mr. MICHENER. When the Treasury Department accepts these sites do they require good title, perfect title as shown by the record?

Mr. BYRNS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I suppose so. I never knew them to accept a title that was not perfect.

Mr. Cramton. They will have to require the same kind of a title for a site donated as for a site purchased.

Mr. MICHENER. It must be such a title as is passed on by the Attorney General, the same as a title that is purchased?

Mr. Cramton. Absolutely.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There is no use of passing on the title now, because I am going to object to this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Is it not true that under the last appropriation where the Government owns lots a preference is given for the building of post offices to the town in which it owns such lot?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; if heretofore purchased under the public acts of Congress. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PREFERRED HOMESTEAD ENTRY RIGHT TO SOLDIERS, ETC.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 181, to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922 and as extended December 28, 1922, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 181, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the joint resolution and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after "war," insert " , military occupation, or military expedition."

Page 2, line 15, after "Provided," insert "That for the purposes of this resolution the war with Spain shall be considered to include the period from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902: *Provided further*."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, is this a unanimous request?

Mr. COLTON. It is.

Mr. GARNER. To consider Senate amendments to a House bill? Does this come from the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. COLTON. It does; with the approval of the minority members of the committee.

Mr. GARNER. How much land is it proposed to take this time in this bill?

Mr. COLTON. We are not proposing to take any. For 10 years the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States who participated in the war with Germany have had a preferred right of homestead entry. That right expired in February of this year. This resolution extends that period for another 10 years and includes veterans of all wars. When public lands are opened for entry it gives a preference right to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who have participated in any war.

Mr. GARNER. Is that preference right calculated to keep other people from taking up homestead rights?

Mr. COLTON. No; a preference right is given to these veterans for 60 or 90 days, and at the expiration of that time, if the land is not entered, it is opened to public for entry.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The Senate amendments to this House joint resolution are the very provisions of the resolution which were stricken out in the House. The House ought to be informed as to that.

Mr. COLLINS. I thought we had an agreement about amendments on bills on the Consent Calendar. There is no use in letting these bills pass with amendments if the Senate eliminates the amendments and the House conferees accept them and bring the bills back to the House as originally drawn.

Mr. COLTON. The House bill reported by the Committee on Public Lands contained the language that the Senate has put in the bill. It was stricken out in the House. This bill has not been to conference. This bill, as amended, gives men who participated in certain military expeditions to foreign lands the same privilege as that given to the veterans of wars.

Mr. COLLINS. If that is going to be the policy, then bills should be objected to originally, and amendments should not be permitted.

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent is asked to be given to put in certain amendments covering provisions that were stricken out by the House. The gentleman goes over to the Senate, and they restore them. The language is put back in the bill, and then the gentleman comes over here and asks unanimous consent that the House agree to the very thing that it struck out.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman has not conferred with any Senator on the matter. This course is frequently pursued. We are asking concurrence in the Senate amendments.

Mr. GARNER. How that comes about nobody knows; but they do take the exact language and restore it, and then the gentleman comes back to the House and asks us to do the very thing we refused to do at the beginning.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I am not against the bill, but I am going to protect the action of the House on a previous occasion, and therefore I am going to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

NATIONAL REFERENDUM ON PROHIBITION

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey for 15 minutes.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this distinguished body since 1925, and since that time the subject of prohibition has been discussed upon the floor of this House—passionately always.

Those for prohibition will not admit that Congress was wrong in imposing its will upon a free people, and those against insist that the amendment created an un-American class distinction which has destroyed American character.

As I view the question, it is absolutely necessary to start with an open mind and seek the middle of the road. Neither the extreme so-called "wets" nor the "drys" will ever provide a solution.

It is not a question of whether or not one desires a drink; it is a far more important question, for it deals with the soul of a great Nation.

The very latest advice offered over the radio and through the newspapers by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Doctor Klein, suggests that tourists remain in America and spend their money here in order to return the much-talked-of "Hoover prosperity."

While I consider Doctor Klein an optimist to believe this will bring about prosperity, nevertheless it sounds like good advice.

However, I wonder if Doctor Klein realizes that one of the principal reasons why so many Americans go abroad every summer is because America is no longer a popular summer playground and it is a well-known fact that greater freedom can be had in other countries.

The latest cruise offered now is an ocean trip to no particular port—just to relax and enjoy a cool drink beyond the 12-mile limit. Enjoy violating the prohibition law while cruising on the high seas for six days and return. I imagine it will be a most popular trip for tired business people and of great benefit to our British brethren under whose auspices the trip is planned.

How long will a nation continue great when its laws are ridiculed and disobeyed?

This is the question, as I see it, that we must concern ourselves with. We must divest ourselves of all prejudices and outside control and think only of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Granted that our duty seems plain, that the law demands obedience, who is there in this body who will not admit that as long as life remains we will battle against injustice and tyranny? Had this not been true generations ago our country would never have led the nations of the world as it does to-day.

It may be difficult to admit, but we know that no law has ever been observed by the masses unless that law had public opinion supporting it.

We know that public opinion demands the punishment of the murderer, the thief, the home destroyer, the man or woman who commits any crime against a fellow man and considers such punishment simple justice; but in the breaking of the law that has to do with taking or buying a drink such law is not supported by public opinion and therefore not considered a crime.

You can not change the habits of a lifetime nor make an act a crime since 1920 that was not a crime previous to that year.

It is because this is true that the thinking men and women of the country have organized to bring this unfair, sumptuary law out in the open for discussion in order to cure a far greater evil than drink at its worst. We realize that something must be done if our country shall not be delivered into the hands of the new type criminal—the "organized bootlegger."

We know that the ordinary "bootlegger" of eight or nine years ago—the man who sold liquor and paid for protection—has been supplanted by a far greater menace during the past few years, for bootlegging is now an organized underworld business, made up of the lowest type criminal—the man to whom life means little and who does not hesitate to commit murder or any other crime when his business is interfered with.

Too many fine lives have already paid the price trying to enforce the law, while the price paid through taxation has been a heavy load for our citizens to carry.

Let us, therefore, take a look at this law from an absolutely neutral point of view. It was brought about, probably, through good motives—to assist the weakling—believing that the law could cure character weakness—a false premise from which to begin.

It was thought that with the outlawing of liquor and closed saloons we soon would have closed prisons.

We know that every prison throughout the country—State and Federal—is overcrowded now and that the authorities responsible for these prisons are terrified at what may happen

to-morrow. We know, too, that 50 per cent of our prison population is under 25 years of age.

Men huddled together like animals grow desperate, and desperation causes them to commit crimes they would not think of committing under ordinary circumstances. Are they responsible for the recent frightful loss of life suffered in the Ohio State prison, or are we whose business it is to find a cure for an admitted evil?

The recent hearings before the Judiciary Committee, if listened to with an open mind, could not fail to convince the most ardent "dry" that we have before us the greatest moral issue this country has ever been called upon to solve.

This committee has not had the courage to face the question and report a bill that could be brought before the House for debate and action.

I say it is a peculiar method of evading a great responsibility. I do not care whether you represent a "wet" or "dry" constituency you can not evade a responsibility by turning your back to it. It will come before you in the still, small hours of the night, or it may come through the ruin of a dear one in your own home. Who can tell how we may be called upon to pay for a neglected duty.

A few days ago we held our memorial services in this House for our colleagues of a year ago. Our turn may come to-morrow, and of what avail, when we are called upon to render an account of our stewardship, to say we thought we were right.

It seems to me we should investigate and know whether or not we are right. In every large center of population to-day the struggle between decency and corruption is greater than at any time in our history. Would this be true if prohibition meant what its strongest advocates intended it to mean?

For the sake of argument, I shall assume that many prohibitionists were actuated by a desire to benefit mankind. Since, after a trial of 10 years, it is a detriment rather than a benefit, why do these good-intentioned people not face the issue, admit they were wrong, and join forces with those of us who are seeking a solution of this intolerable condition?

I have a great respect for my colleagues in this House whether or not I agree with you, and feel certain many of you would like to be relieved of the unsavory label of the Anti-Saloon League, whose business transactions, as disclosed by recent testimony before the Senate committee, conclusively prove this league to be what we have always suspected it to be, an organization of clever men who prey upon ignorance and prejudice for their own personal gain. If altruism prompted these men we could forgive their mistakes; but no such reason has been or ever will be found for the terrible crimes they are responsible for in their despicable work of threatening men and distorting facts.

I believe that Congress is and has been controlled, to some extent, by this league and its allied church organizations; and I believe the time has come when this strangle hold on perfectly honest Members of Congress shall be destroyed.

Paid lobbyists should be driven from the halls of Congress, and Members should be free to do what their conscience prompts them to do.

The letters and threats which I have received since the introduction of my resolution calling for a national referendum of the prohibition question, prove to what extent ignorant people may go.

This resolution merely provides a method by which the people who elect us to represent them, may decide this big question. It takes the problem out of our hands and permits the people themselves to accept the responsibility that, up to now, seems to have been assumed by the Anti-Saloon League and a minority of church organizations.

Members of this House should welcome a "show down" on this big moral question. We should not fear being counted; yet the opportunity is denied because it is impossible to get before the House any bill that would bring about a fair debate and submit the question to the country. Because this is true, I have a petition at the desk, to which I would invite the attention of the Members and ask them to sign in order to bring up my resolution for debate.

The first report of the Hoover Law Enforcement Commission is a pathetic admission of the unwisdom of Federal prohibition and the impossibility of enforcing it.

Ten years of trial, costing the taxpayers over \$400,000,000, and that which is much more important, a tremendous loss of life, have shown its folly.

The honest friends of prohibition should admit its failure and help secure a better remedy. Adding additional millions of expense to the overburdened taxpayer, appointing hundreds of men to continue the work in the Federal courts, multiplying the personnel of the Coast Guard, building prisons everywhere to house men declared criminals because they were caught buying or selling a drink, will never solve the prohibition question.

In a country composed of people of all nations, with as many different complexes and habits, such a law could never hope to be enforced. No person guilty of breaking the law regards him or her self a criminal. The conscience of a man does not rebel against a drink of liquor. He considers prohibition tyranny and far removed from the virtue of temperance.

Every right-minded person desires temperance and before the eighteenth amendment became part of the Constitution we had made progress in temperance. Had the millions spent in exploiting an experiment been spent in educating our people, particularly our young people in the schools of the country, we would not to-day have the sad conditions confronting us everywhere.

We must retrace our steps, courageously confess our mistake, and permit the people to cooperate with us in finding a solution that will be satisfying to the masses. When this is done we shall find less crime around the corner, less need of new prisons, less hospitals for the insane, greater happiness in the home of America, and a finer and better youth.

I have received thousands of letters from all parts of the country approving my resolution calling for a national referendum, and I, therefore, consider it my duty to place before you, who represent these people, the opportunity of signing my petition so that they may know whether or not you believe the people themselves have the right to express their convictions upon this question that intimately concerns—not only themselves but the future of our own great country.

At the present time questions of great importance to the security and happiness of our beloved country are being submerged, and in the elections this year the important issue presented to the voters will be whether or not they are in favor of prohibition.

Many otherwise good candidates will go down to defeat as a result of the injustice of prohibition. Therefore it is important to take the question out of politics by allowing the people to vote on it.

Whatever the majority votes, the minority will support, for it will be the first opportunity the people of the country have had to express their convictions. They will do so in this case, when the honor and life of a great Nation are at stake.

I therefore urge you to sign my petition on the Speaker's desk, so that we may have a fair opportunity to present the question to the country. A national referendum will decide the matter right. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the lady be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. I am very much concerned as to the effect of prohibition on our youth and therefore would have you recall that when Doctor Polling, of the Penny Foundation and Christian Endeavor of New York, appeared before the Judiciary Committee he stated that he had conducted a poll of 62 presidents of leading colleges and 26 replied that student drinking is not general; 3 others said it was; and 1 admitted that it had increased since prohibition.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks, if there is no objection, the inclosed poll taken by the president of the Harvard Crimson, of Harvard University, on collegiate prohibition, which refutes the testimony offered by Doctor Polling.

I would also like to have included in the RECORD the text of my resolution, H. J. Res. 219, for the convenience of Members who may be interested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey to extend her remarks in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

The poll and resolution referred to follow:

THE HARVARD CRIMSON,
Cambridge, Mass., April 29, 1930.

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON,
Committee on the District of Columbia,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: I inclose the final report of our college prohibition poll, as I promised earlier in the month to do.

I hope the data it contains will be of service to you and that you will let me know if there is any other possible information connected with colleges and prohibition which I might be able to furnish you.

Very truly yours,

PAUL M. SWEETZ,
President of the Crimson.

REPORT ON COLLEGIATE PROHIBITION POLL, CONDUCTED BY THE HARVARD CRIMSON, APRIL, 1930

(Drawn up by Paul M. Sweetz, Geoffrey Parsons, Jr., and Robert S. Morison)

The recently conducted polls held in many of the country's colleges had two chief objects. The first and perhaps the more significant was to discover whether or not there is at the present time a drinking problem in the universities of the Nation. Various supposedly reliable witnesses, including several college presidents, have appeared or allowed themselves to be quoted before the House Judiciary Committee as of the opinion that drinking is virtually nonexistent in the college of to-day. If, indeed, such were the case, it was felt that it would be interesting to have supporting figures. The second object of the poll was to determine the attitude of the American undergraduate toward prohibition. The second object is admittedly less a matter of fact, and therefore the results are probably less reliable; nevertheless, it reflects in the aggregate what the rising generation thinks of the handiwork of its predecessors.

This report will include not only the colleges which voted in the inter-collegiate poll sponsored by the Harvard Crimson but also a number of colleges which held polls independently. The first group is made up of Harvard, Princeton, Michigan, Cornell, Dartmouth, the University of Pennsylvania, Brown, Lafayette, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Colgate, Pittsburg, Purdue, Amherst, and Assumption College (Worcester, Mass.). The independent polls are the following: Bowdoin, Clark, Denver University, Illinois, New York University, Radcliffe, University of Virginia, and Yale. This completes a list of 22 institutions.

The representative nature of the poll may be understood when it is pointed out that there are five State universities, one engineering school, 6 private universities of over 2,000, and 6 smaller colleges, i. e., under 2,000. One women's college and separate voting in three coeducational universities are included in this list.

Geographically the distribution is as follows: Eighteen in the East, 3 in the Mid West, and 1 each in the South and the far West. The total enrollment of the institutions is approximately 117,801, according to the figures of the 1930 World Almanac. The poll was not expected to reach all the students in the universities, but it may be reasonably assumed that the voters represent a fair cross section of the total enrollment. In most cases no attempt was made to reach the entire student body, and only those who passed the places of voting were recorded. It is reasonable to assume that on a given day no larger percentage of dries than wets or vice versa would pass through the classroom buildings. The total vote cast, not counting ballots cast out for duplication, etc., comes to 35,760. Of this number 2,297 were cast by women.

The vote by universities is as follows:

Amherst	496
Assumption	119
Bowdoin	432
Brown	914
Clark	263
Colgate	663
Cornell	2,196
Dartmouth	1,242
Denver	764
Harvard	3,560
Illinois	3,892
Lafayette	671
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1,465
Michigan	5,761
New York University	2,349
Pennsylvania	1,578
Pittsburgh	2,571
Princeton	1,888
Purdue	276
Radcliffe	208
Virginia	920
Yale	2,648
Total	35,760

The fact that the same ballot was not used in every case is to be regretted, but it was nevertheless inevitable. The only way that an exactly similar poll could be held at a number of institutions at once would be to have assistants of one organization directing each separate poll. This was obviously impossible, and the poll as held was the best that could be done under the circumstances. Inasmuch as the ballot suggested by the Crimson was the one most generally used, the results in this report will be on the questions on that ballot only. They are:

Do you ever drink? Yes, _____. No, _____.
Do you ever get drunk? Yes, _____. No, _____.
If you do not drink, check principal reason: (a) Legal restrictions;

(b) family; (c) personal taste.
Do you favor: (a) Present prohibition situation; (b) strict enforcement; (c) modification of present laws; (e) total repeal of liquor legislation.

For purposes of tabulating the grand totals, the questions in the last group have been consolidated under two headings so that the questions on some of the different ballots, which were worded slightly differently,

¹ Separate polls for men and women.

may be included. These headings are first: Those favoring prohibition, that is either the present situation or strict enforcement, and second those favoring modification or repeal. The totals figured on this basis follow:

ON THE LIQUOR SITUATION—ALL COLLEGES VOTING

In favor of prohibition..... 7,089
In favor of modification or repeal..... 26,150

ON DRINKING AMONG STUDENTS

Eighteen colleges voting, as follows: Cornell, Dartmouth, Michigan, Colgate, Pittsburgh, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Assumption, Purdue, Princeton, Amherst, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, New York University, Brown, Clark, Illinois, University of Virginia, Yale.

Drink..... 21,236
Do not drink..... 12,365

ON DRUNKENNESS AMONG STUDENTS

Twelve colleges voting, as follows: Cornell, Michigan, Colgate, Assumption, Harvard, Purdue, Princeton, Amherst, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Brown, Illinois, and University of Virginia.

Get drunk..... 6,001
Drink, but do not get drunk..... 7,883

REASONS FOR NOT DRINKING

Fourteen colleges voting, as follows: Cornell, Dartmouth, Michigan, Colgate, Pittsburgh, Assumption, Harvard, Purdue, Princeton, Amherst, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Brown, Illinois, and University of Virginia.

Legal restrictions..... 619
Family..... 922
Personal taste..... 7,717

The distinction between the votes cast for modification and repeal is nevertheless an important one and the respective numbers, as closely as they can be calculated, are as follows:

Modification..... 14,992
Repeal..... 11,158

On the ballots used at Bowdoin and Yale the question was asked so that the only alternatives were enforcement or repeal. These figures, therefore, are probably too favorable to the advocates of repeal, it being safe to assume that the correct ratio would be about 3 modificationists to every 2 who favor repeal.

Approximate ratios covering all the questions follow: Six modificationists to 4 repealers to 3 for enforcement; 7 drinkers to 4 nondrinkers; 8 who drink but do not get drunk to 6 who drink and get drunk; 16 who do not drink on account of personal taste to 2 who do not drink on account of family considerations to 1 who does not drink on account of legal restrictions.

In the ranks of the women the following institutions are represented: Illinois, Michigan, New York University, and Radcliffe.

The aggregate figures are given in the following tables:

VOTES CAST

Illinois..... 939
Michigan..... 910
New York University..... 240
Radcliffe..... 208

Total..... 2,297

ON THE LIQUOR SITUATION—ALL FOUR COLLEGES VOTING

In favor of prohibition..... 811
In favor of modification..... 1,104
In favor of repeal..... 344

ON DRINKING AMONG STUDENTS

Three colleges voting, as follows (Illinois, Michigan, New York University):

Drink..... 745
Do not drink..... 1,243

REASONS FOR NOT DRINKING

Two colleges voting, as follows (Illinois, Michigan):

Legal restrictions..... 71
Family..... 136
Personal taste..... 1,424

N. B.—Drunkenness was not included on the ballots for women.

Ratios: 11 modificationists to 8 for enforcement to 3 repealers; 15 drinkers to 25 nondrinkers; 57 who do not drink on account of personal taste to 5 who do not drink on account of family considerations to 3 who do not drink on account of legal restrictions.

Tabulation of the Crimson's prohibition poll

	Amherst	Technology	Brown	Bowdoin	Clark
Do you ever drink?—					
Yes.....	357	607	555	92	
No.....	139	538	395	96	
Do you ever get drunk?—					
Yes.....	208	361	275		
No.....	146	538	280		
Principal reasons for abstinence—					
A. Legal restrictions.....	8	39	13		
B. Family reasons.....	20	37	37		
C. Personal taste.....	126	553	353		

Tabulation of the Crimson's prohibition poll—Continued

	Amherst	Technology	Brown	Bowdoin	Clark
Do you favor—					
A. Present prohibition situation.....	10	34	10		
B. Strict enforcement.....	77	363	163	104	85
C. Modifications of present laws.....	285	540	463		76
D. Complete repeal of liquor legislation.....	122	323	173	328	95
Total votes cast.....	496	1,465	914	432	263

	Yale	Cornell	Dartmouth	Lafayette	Michigan
Do you ever drink?—					
Yes.....	1,874	1,513	801		3,888
No.....	769	683	441		1,873
Do you ever get drunk?—					
Yes.....		673			674
No.....		717			2,414
Principal reasons for abstinence—					
A. Legal restrictions.....		68	16		202
B. Family reasons.....		10	91		115
C. Personal taste.....		620	426		1,517
Do you favor—					
A. Present prohibition situation.....		60			157
B. Strict enforcement.....		426	387	188	1,046
C. Modifications of present laws.....		1,144	720	240	2,966
D. Complete repeal of liquor legislation.....		2,113	542	529	820
Total votes cast.....		2,648	2,196	1,242	5,761

	Denver	University of Illinois	New York University	Radcliffe	University of Virginia
Do you ever drink?—					
Yes.....		2,105	1,398		713
No.....		1,787	937		207
Do you ever get drunk?—					
Yes.....		733			482
No.....		1,298			229
Principal reasons for abstinence—					
A. Legal restrictions.....		121			12
B. Family reasons.....		286			39
C. Personal taste.....		1,784			160
Do you favor—					
A. Present prohibition situation.....		209			18
B. Strict enforcement.....		154	1,003	294	82
C. Modifications of present laws.....		942	1,348	156	75
D. Complete repeal of liquor legislation.....		516	481	123	459
Total votes cast.....		764	3,892	2,349	208

	Colgate	Pittsburgh	Assumption
Do you ever drink?—			
Yes.....	440	1,535	83
No.....	223	1,036	30
Do you ever get drunk?—			
Yes.....	240		5
No.....	189		84
Principal reasons for abstinence—			
A. Legal restrictions.....	8	35	3
B. Family reasons.....	34	57	2
C. Personal taste.....	241	908	31
Do you favor—			
A. Present prohibition situation.....	26	69	
B. Strict enforcement.....	170	509	2
C. Modifications of present laws.....	386	1,101	52
D. Complete repeal of liquor legislation.....	84	896	64
Total votes cast.....	663	2,571	113

	Harvard University	Pennsylvania	Purdue	Princeton
Do you ever drink?—				
Yes.....	2,646	674	162	1,493
No.....	914	904	114	395
Do you ever get drunk?—				
Yes.....	1,431	72	78	836
No.....	1,214	232	116	657
Principal reasons for abstinence—				
A. Legal restrictions.....	55		28	11
B. Family reasons.....	96		40	58
C. Personal taste.....	635		46	317
Do you favor—				
A. Present prohibition situation.....	61		18	20
B. Strict enforcement.....	436		94	209
C. Modifications of present laws.....	1,555		110	966
D. Complete repeal of liquor legislation.....	1,018		54	675
Total votes cast.....	3,560	1,578	276	1,888

House Joint Resolution 219, Seventy-first Congress, second session
Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for a referendum on the eighteenth amendment thereof

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

“ARTICLE —

“Each State shall submit to the electors thereof at the next general congressional election therein, after three months from the date of the adoption of this amendment, the question whether or not the eighteenth amendment to this Constitution shall be repealed.

“The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

“Each State shall conduct such election therein and determine the result as the law thereof provides or, in the absence of such State law, in such manner as the Congress shall provide.

“On the expiration of the time for such election in all the States the submission of the question shall be complete.

“If a majority of all the people voting thereon vote for the repeal, the eighteenth amendment shall thereupon cease to be a part of this Constitution; but the Congress shall retain power to prohibit the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors in violation of State laws, and no State shall permit or authorize the conduct of a saloon.”

ADDITIONAL LAND FOR THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the Consent Calendar.

The first business in order on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11433) to amend the act entitled “An act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for the Library of Congress, and for other purposes,” approved May 21, 1928, relating to the condemnation of land.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice that the report on this bill coming from the Committee on the Library, and it is not the first time I make the criticism, that the report does not contain any reference to the existing law. It is very helpful, in the examination of these bills, to have some reference to the existing law. It is laborious enough to pore over a bill and report; it becomes a heavy task to refer to the Code for the existing law.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. You will not find this law in the Code. It was a law carried on an appropriation bill, a rider on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there is so much more need to have it incorporated in the report, so that the few of us who examine these bills may save our time and strength.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] that he has not complied with the rule; and, reading from the gentleman's treatise on Parliamentary Law, I gather that he is in favor of a legislative body complying strictly with the rules. May I ask the gentleman that when he again reports a bill from the Committee on the Library he will comply with the rule?

Mr. LUCE. I accept the admonition of my colleague with due humility, and in the future will try to conform therewith. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 2 of the act entitled “An act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for the Library of Congress, and for other purposes,” approved May 21, 1928, is amended to read as follows: “Any condemnation proceedings necessary to be instituted under the authority of this act shall be in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled ‘An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States,’ approved March 1, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 40, ch. 7).”

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONGRESS OF MILITARY MEDICINE AND PHARMACY AT BUDAPEST

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to go back to Calendar No. 402 and consider the House Joint Resolu-

tion 253, to provide for the expenses of a delegation of the United States to the sixth meeting of the Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Budapest in 1931.

The question was raised yesterday as to whether or not any delegates to be appointed to the congress by the President would be selected from outside of the service establishments. I have made inquiry since then and I have in my hand a letter from the Surgeon General stating that there has never been a delegate appointed to any military medical congress in the past who has not been in active service, in the Organized Reserve, in the National Guard, or in the Public Health Service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I understood it was announced that the Clerk would begin at a certain place on the Consent Calendar to-day. Members who were opposed to the bills appearing before that bill might not be here. It might take some one by surprise, although I am not opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Oregon if the resolution yesterday was stricken off the calendar?

Mr. KORELL. It was stricken off yesterday. The gentleman who objected, however, is not opposed to it now.

The SPEAKER. For the time being the Chair would rather not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

MINISTER, UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 282) authorizing the appointment of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE], member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if there is any movement on foot for the appointment of ministers to any of the other British self-governing dominions, outside of the Dominion of Canada and the South African Union at this time? I have no objection to the resolution, which I am sure is all right, but I would like this information.

Mr. COLE. There is none that has come to our committee, as far as I know.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What happened to the minister to Liberia?

Mr. COLE. His salary was increased to \$10,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman not think we have too many foreign officers now?

Mr. COLE. We have a foreign officer in South Africa. This is simply to raise his salary and place it on an equality with other similar salaries and positions.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there is a little more than that in this resolution. I think this resolution designates this man as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. It is customary to use all of those words. As a matter of fact, I think it is desirable that this Government have a representative of this dignity in South Africa.

Mr. COLLINS. We have one in Liberia.

Mr. CRAMTON. I favored that, and I think we should keep the same relation with the British community in South Africa as we do with Canada.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We should not treat the South African Republic as a colony. They have their own parliament. They have their own sovereignty, and we recognize them as such.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. HOOPER. They have, as a matter of fact, the right of secession from the British Empire.

Mr. COLLINS. I think this resolution should go over.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. The South African Union has a representative here, a very able representative. Our representative in South Africa, Mr. Ralph J. Totten, of Tennessee, has been a long time in the Foreign Service and is a very able gentleman, who would fill this position very acceptably.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. This condition arises by reason of the fact that the British Government has accorded to the representatives of their Dominion a diplomatic officer.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have appointed such diplomatic officer from South Africa to our country and this is a matter of comity, to extend like consideration to South Africa.

Mr. CRAMTON. As a matter of fact, I think this should be given consideration. In international councils on more than one occasion the representatives of Canada and South Africa and other British dominions have stood with our representatives in international policies.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. HOOPER. As a matter of fact, the self-governing dominions of the British Empire are sending ministers to other countries as well as to the United States. I noticed the other day that they have just accredited a Canadian minister to Japan, and as far as the Union of South Africa is concerned, it stands on the same footing as the other great British dominions and has even the right of secession without interference on the part of the Empire.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will realize that the committee will have the Calendar Wednesday call to-morrow, and they can bring this up to-morrow.

Mr. COLLINS. It may be a good thing to object to it for that reason. I doubt very much if there is much legislation of importance on the calendar.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, yes. There is a great deal on the calendar for to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, as the representative of the United States, an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa, who shall receive as compensation the sum of \$10,000 per annum.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we have just passed comes from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We all know of the serious illness of the distinguished and much loved and respected chairman of that committee, Mr. PORTER, who is quite ill in the Naval Hospital. We all hope he will soon be restored to health and take his place among the Members of this House. [Applause.]

PUBLIC ROAD, WIND RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION, WYO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 320) authorizing reconstruction and improvement of a public road in Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have discussed this with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. CARTER], who is much interested in its passage. He has expressed willingness to accept two amendments. The bill stands in a class by itself. It is likely to be regarded as a precedent in later cases and hence seems to me of importance. The bill, with the amendments that I will propose, will limit the appropriation for this road from the Federal Treasury, to \$150,000, and that the Federal appropriation shall not be more than one-half the expense of constructing the road. Inasmuch as the road is over Federal-owned lands, an Indian reservation, the State being willing to put up one-half of the cost of construction, I have no objection whatever to the bill.

I then add one other amendment, requiring only Indian labor to be employed, except for engineering and supervision.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read this bill it is more liberal in its provisions than the general bill we passed yesterday authorizing the building of public roads through the unreserved public domain, in that the State contributes its proportionate part.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is liberal on the question of the State's contribution, and I am heartily in favor of it on that account. It is a road that will be of importance to this State because it connects important highways.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. But \$150,000 will not provide all they need.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think their expectation is that something less than \$300,000 will be the cost, of which the Federal Government puts up half.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It will cost about \$8,000 a year to maintain it.

Mr. CRAMTON. The State is to maintain it.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Is not this bill on all fours with the one introduced by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ], and objected to?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not recall that bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the bill to which the gentleman refers the entire burden was to be borne by the National Government.

Mr. LEAVITT. The Committee on Indian Affairs considers this bill to be therefore more meritorious than the one to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. COLLINS. I understand we make a yearly appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. LEAVITT. Not sufficient from the Federal Government for this road.

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. This is all the money that will be appropriated, and the State will maintain the road.

Mr. COLLINS. We do carry an appropriation in the Interior Department appropriation bill for such roads, so let us be accurate about this matter.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will explain that to the gentleman. There is an item in the Interior Department appropriation bill of \$250,000 for the construction of roads on Indian reservations. That item was primarily a matter of Indian relief, to give needed employment to the Indians in a productive way. Now, when you allot the \$250,000 among the many Indian reservations it does not permit of such an ambitious program as provided here. That amount only provides for a few thousand dollars on each reservation.

Mr. COLLINS. General legislation should be passed and each case can thus be provided for, so why should not that amount be increased?

Mr. CRAMTON. For this reason: The Senate did propose to increase it this year, but my fear as to that was—that item being primarily a matter of Indian relief, the building of roads needed by the Indians and their needs to be primarily considered—that if it was made a large amount so it could take in such an item as this, then the Indian end of it would be lost sight of and that the needs of adjacent white communities would dominate.

Mr. LEAVITT. In addition to that, if it were built under that sort of an appropriation the Government would pay 100 per cent, and the maintenance on Indian reservations might be upon the Government.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the amendment be agreed to that this is to be a 50-50 proposition?

Mr. CRAMTON. It will be; yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. There is complete agreement on that.

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. And the State will forever maintain the road.

Mr. STAFFORD. The effect of this is to increase the appropriation allotted to the State, because the provisions of the general road law provide one-half by the State and one-half by the National Government.

Mr. LEAVITT. If this road were constructed under the Federal aid act and it would ultimately be added to the 7 per cent system of Wyoming, being on an Indian reservation, it would be entitled to 100 per cent of Federal money. Thus, under this bill the Federal Government is saving half the cost of this road, and a promise has been secured from the State to permanently maintain it.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If this road connects other State highways, then it is not a Federal project.

Mr. LEAVITT. It would be a Federal project if placed under the 7 per cent system, and it would be entitled to 100 per cent under that present law.

Mr. GREENWOOD. But this road is not entirely a Federal project?

Mr. LEAVITT. No.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Therefore the 50-50 plan is an equitable one?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; it is justified from both State and Federal angles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum

of \$150,000 for the reconstruction and improvement of the road running northwest from Milford across Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservation, through Fort Washakie to the diversion dam in Wyoming, approximately 30 miles, and lying wholly within said Indian reservation, on condition that the State or county, or both, shall defray the remainder of the cost and agree in writing to maintain the road without expense to the Government or the Indians: *Provided*, That the work on said road shall be jointly under the supervision and direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of," strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "not more than \$150,000 to pay not more than one-half the cost."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 2, line 4, after the word "Roads," insert "and only Indian labor shall be employed, except for engineering and supervision."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment and wish to have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman has it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Suppose Indian labor is not available to perform this work?

Upon the Menominee Reservation some years ago a distinguished former Senator from my State, who was inclined toward the idea of public ownership, had erected on the Menominee Indian Reservation a sawmill at a cost of several million dollars out of the Menominee Indian trust fund. The idea was to give employment to the Indians on the reservation, but later developments showed that the Indians would not always work. It is proverbial that some Indians do not care to work.

Now, we wish to have this road built and the amendment does not provide if Indian labor is available but makes it absolutely mandatory that the work shall be performed by Indian labor.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is believed the labor is available on this reservation. They have a large Indian population and they need the work. The situation is much different in the matter of road building, which requires entirely unskilled labor and untrained labor, perhaps, from the operation of a sawmill. As a matter of fact, I know something about the Menominee sawmill, and it is in large part operated with Indian labor, but the organization there must be definite and composed of certain trained personnel. It is a much more complicated situation than the building of roads.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman quite certain that Indian labor exclusively will be available for the building of this road?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; it is believed so. The provision is not applicable to supervision, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; but I would think the amendment should provide that Indian labor should be employed if it is available.

Mr. CRAMTON. To be effective at all it is not desirable to have too many "ifs" in it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Just so the road will be built, that is the desideratum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELESS AND DESTITUTE CHIPPEWA INDIANS IN FOREST, LANGLADE, AND ONEIDA COUNTIES, WIS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10932) for the relief of homeless and destitute Chippewa Indians in Forest, Langlade, and Oneida Counties, Wis.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I think I am going to object, here are these poor Indians, and there are 141 of them in all. It is proposed to appropriate \$3,500 to investigate their destitute condition, when these poor Indians were investigated in 1919, on June 14, 1922, again in 1922, and in 1924. There are 141 of them, 5 of them are blind, 13 are orphans, 14 are aged and decrepit. They have all the

information that they possibly can have on these poor, unfortunate people.

Now, give them the \$3,500, but do not spend any more money to investigate their destitute condition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and confirming in part what the gentleman has just said, the bureau has every authority to investigate now, and I think they have money that could be used for that purpose. I would like to ask that the bill be passed over. I am expecting some information as to the condition of these Indians that I would like to have before the bill is considered.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. May I say in reply to the gentleman that these Indians at the present time are not getting any relief and they have not at any time in the past?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing to prevent it.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. The department claims there is no money available that they can use for the relief of these Indians because of the fact they are not enrolled.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, no; that is not correct. They do not have to be enrolled in order to get money. It may be that certain moneys could not be used, but other moneys are available, and if not they can bring in an estimate in the pending deficiency bill for such moneys as may be necessary.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Does the gentleman from Michigan say that the department has money to make this investigation that is provided in this bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Why do you want an investigation, in the name of common sense?

Mr. CRAMTON. If they have not enough funds for such purpose, they ought to have it.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I may say to the gentleman from New York that it is quite necessary to make a census of these Indians and such a census has never been made.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That has been made and you know there are 141 of them, you know they are poor, you know they need relief. Why do you not strike out everything in the bill and simply appropriate the \$3,500 for their relief?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. The bill provides for investigating what particular tribes they belong to and what rights they may have.

Mr. O'CONNELL. May I ask how much money we have already spent on these previous investigations?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Of course, as the gentleman knows, investigations always cost something.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; this one is going to cost \$3,500.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And I do not think this House ought to spend \$3,500 on investigating 141 Indians that we know are destitute.

Mr. O'CONNELL. And have already been overinvestigated.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Absolutely. You can not feed these Indians on investigations.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Has it been established by the previous investigations that these Indians are members of the Chippewa Tribe?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. It has not. A census has never been concluded and therefore the Comptroller General holds that the department has no right to spend appropriations on Indians who have not been enrolled.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It strikes me they are either members of the Chippewa Tribe or they are wards of the State of Wisconsin, one or the other, and they ought either to be taken care of out of the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians or they ought to be taken care of by the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. But they are not members of the tribe. They are not enrolled.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Then they are indigent citizens of the gentleman's State.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say that provision can be made for the relief of these Indians in the second deficiency bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the department brings in a case there is authority to make the appropriation.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. We have been informed the department does not have authority to spend money for the care of indigent Indians who are not enrolled in such a way as to bring them within the jurisdiction of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Can not an amendment to this bill be prepared so that you can get the appropriation in the second deficiency bill? They want relief, they do not want an investigation.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman from Nevada brought in a bill such as the gentleman refers to to take care of this same sort of situation, so that the Government could perform that service for the scattered Indians, but it was objected to and defeated.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That was too broad. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will prepare an amendment giving this authority—I do not care whether they belong to the Chippewa Tribe or whether they are enrolled—what you want is to give them relief.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. The department must have an appropriation for the purpose of getting the census of the Indians, and the tribe that they belong to, and what they are entitled to under the treaty between the tribes and the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE ACT AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY TO DEPENDENT RELATIVES OF OFFICERS, ENLISTED MEN, AND NURSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7639) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses, whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct," approved May 22, 1928.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope the gentleman will not object. This department bill is approved by the Director of the Budget, and the entire three pages of language only changes existing law by half a dozen words. The original act of 1920 providing for this gratuity for dependent relatives of officers and men killed in the line of duty was amended by an act in 1928, in order to insert certain departmental language to expedite the settlement of the cases.

Now, it appears that even with that language in the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy was not sufficient to expedite the settlement. By this bill that language is taken out and has additional language of 15 words added.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But the change of one word will sometimes alter the whole spirit of the law. This takes away the final action by the comptroller and leaves it to the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will call the gentleman's attention to the language inserted in 1928 which was intended to do the very thing the gentleman from New York is talking about. That language is this:

Provided, That the determination of the facts of dependency in all cases of dependent relatives, of personnel of the Navy or Marine Corps, whether previously designated or not, by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Now, Congress felt that language was necessary in order to give the Secretary of the Navy the right and authority to expedite these unimportant payments—unimportant to the Treasury, but important to the relative of the officer or the man who died.

Now, it occurs that the Comptroller of the Currency feels that the language is not broad enough.

Mr. COLLINS. If the claim is just, you should have no fear of the general accounting officer. I do not believe in the idea or doctrine of permitting a department to audit itself.

Mr. BRITTEN. The language taken from the bill was intended to do the very thing that they now intend to do.

Mr. COLLINS. The purpose of such bills is to destroy the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, no.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is only passing on a question of fact.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is all.

Mr. HASTINGS. It does not pass on a question of law.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not know about that—if all the facts are in the department, they can be submitted to the General Accounting Office, and let this disinterested agency go over them.

Mr. BRITTEN. Very often a case arises like this: A man is killed in the line of duty. Up to the moment of his death he has not declared any dependent, but after his death it develops he has some dependent—a child, a wife, a mother, or father—who has been receiving a certain portion of his pay monthly. So he has a dependent, although it is not indicated in the jacket in the department. The Navy Department can now run

that thing down and instantly make settlement with that dependent. The Comptroller General has to send to the department for these records, and the department is better qualified and better organized to make that settlement than the comptroller.

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, they all say they are better organized.

Mr. BRITTEN. We are aiming to do now what we hoped to do two years ago.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MODERNIZATION OF UNITED STATES NAVAL OBSERVATORY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9370) to provide for the modernization of the United States Naval Observatory at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] give us an explanation as to what is purposed for the modernization of the Naval Observatory as carried by this authorization?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I can give some angles to the gentleman from Wisconsin. Our Naval Observatory is probably one of the most interesting as well as valuable institutions we have. The present 26-inch telescope there was built in 1872 and installed, and at the time of its installation the observatory was one of the foremost in the world. There is now no photographic apparatus in connection with the Naval Observatory and there has not been, and the major portion of this appropriation is to modernize that observatory and install up-to-date photographic apparatus for the preservation of the records of the celestial bodies.

In view of the language in which the bill is cast, it is important that it be made clear that no new class of astronomical work on the part of the Government is contemplated. The object of the bill is to afford means of carrying on the established functions of the Naval Observatory in accordance with modern, approved astronomical practice. The construction of an astrographic laboratory does not represent an establishment for a new line of endeavor. It is designed to furnish a suitable building to replace a small frame structure that was moved to the present site of the observatory when the observatory itself was removed from the grounds now occupied by the Naval Hospital. The removal of the observatory was incident to the poor elevation of the old site and the interference with observing caused by the Potomac River mists. Astronomical photography was in its infancy at the time the present observatory establishment and structures were planned.

Photographic methods are now applied largely to all forms of astronomical observation. The photographic method shortens the time required to secure data from the heavens, and hence increases the time that the astronomers are able to give to the computations incident to the reduction of observations. With visual observations, the measurements of the object observed must be made at the eyepiece of the telescope. In a photographic observation an hour's exposure of a photographic plate may yield sufficient material for several days of measurement and discussion.

The measurements can be made in daylight under satisfactory physical conditions; they can be checked back, in case of suspected error, because the record is permanent; they can be applied to objects beyond the range of the keenest eyesight. Until the time of Galileo, naked-eye observations, unassisted by the telescope, were of necessity the principal dependence of astronomers. In a very real sense, the application of photography to astronomy has worked almost as great a revolution in methods of obtaining results as did the telescope of Galileo to the astronomy of his day.

As yet, the Naval Observatory, which carries on the national functions of the Government in respect to the astronomy of position and of time, has never had an appropriation for so much as a single photographic instrument of the major sort. Every photographic instrument in use is a secondhand instrument, obtained at bargain rates from lots of material not in use or about to be retired from other activities.

As long ago as 1906, Prof. Simon Newcomb, then at the height of his fame, said of the Naval Observatory:

The establishment is unique among great observatories in the absence of distinctly modern instruments, especially those for the application of photography.

The fact that the Naval Observatory has had no appropriation for major astronomical instruments since 1894 and that a large part of the work of the institution must be carried on with instruments more than half a century old, in a period when

material and mechanical development is in a high state of efficiency, is a source of great embarrassment to the scientific staff of the establishment. It is a condition so out of keeping with the popular conception of the American attitude toward scientific advancement as to be a source of wondering comment to visitors, especially foreign scientists, who learn at first hand of how inadequate, from a modern point of view, is the equipment of the National Astronomical Observatory of the United States.

The principal features of the modernization will be the construction of a building to house astrographic apparatus, this will cost \$65,000, and is one of the items in the bill; the other item of \$160,000 is for modernization of the observatory and the apparatus generally. This latter as now considered will be a pair of 26-inch doublet photographic objectives for a twin photographic telescope. These will be of the doublet type. A 12-inch guiding telescope with finder and micrometer; an 8-inch Ross-type wide angled lens, with camera and mountings, together with a 6.6-inch photobeliograph of 60-foot focal length, with mirror and mounting and clockwork, especially in the shape of adequate measuring engines or comparators. These together with other apparatus, minor in character, will bring the United States Naval Observatory up to date.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I understand that for 30 years there has not been an appropriation made for a major piece of apparatus or instrument used out there.

Mr. MILLER. There has not been.

Mr. COLTON. It is one of the finest institutions in the American Government, and one of the most beneficial to-day. The men in charge are capable, courteous, efficient officials. They should be furnished with up-to-date equipment and instruments.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It should be added also that the scientific personnel of that observatory stand very high in the scientific world, but they are hampered with the antiquated equipment which they have.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question about the need for the modernization of the equipment, but I direct attention to the proposed estimate for a modern garage amounting to \$40,000.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, personally I would prefer that this bill relate exclusively to the scientific instruments.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I shall move to strike out the \$40,000 item. None of the scientific men in whom I am interested is allowed an automobile or can afford an automobile.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman agree to have stricken out the item for the construction of a service building, amounting to \$40,000?

Mr. MILLER. That is acceptable to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to be expended by the Secretary of the Navy for the following purposes at a cost not to exceed the amount stated after each item enumerated: United States Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C., purchase and installation of equipment, utilities, and appurtenances for astrographic and research work and modernization of the astronomical plant, \$160,000; construction of astrographic laboratory, \$65,000; construction of a service building, \$40,000; total, \$265,000: *Provided*, That the location, plans, and specifications for such buildings shall be approved by the Fine Arts Commission and by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MILLER: Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "construction of a service building, \$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4192) to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary

of the expedition of Capt. Meriwether Lewis and Capt. William Clark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object, in view of the veto message we received on a similar bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported and placed on the Consent Calendar prior to the veto of a companion bill. I recognize that the Congress is not going to pass measures of this kind in view of the earnest position upon the general subject by the administration, and I shall not ask the House to consider a question that it has passed upon by sustaining the veto of the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PAYMENT TO HAWAII OF CERTAIN RENTALS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11134) to amend section 91 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask one question. Why is it not possible for the Federal Government to return this land to the Territory instead of leasing it to private individuals, and then the Territory could make its own terms in leasing its own lands.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. The War Department takes the position that this land may be needed by them at some future time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And they have a recapture clause, I suppose, on short notice in their leases?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I read this report, I thought it was a matter of very minor consequence, and one that would entail some inconvenience to the War Department to pay over these little amounts, I think totaling something like \$7,000.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It may rise to a considerable amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. In view of the high profits accruing to the sugar planters of that Territory, is the Territory so prostrate in its finances that it needs \$7,000 rental that the War Department receives from tenants?

Mr. COLLINS. There is on this calendar, further down, a bill increasing the amount that the Government of the United States pays to legislative officers of Hawaii. The money for this comes out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. There is no increase.

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, yes; there is an increase. The islands get now \$30,000 per annum and a bill on the calendar provides an increase. In one instance you are asking that money be turned into the treasury of the islands, and in the next you are asking for a larger amount out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. We are only asking for money that we think should revert to the Territory. The lands were transferred freely by the Territory to the War Department upon the assumption that the lands would be used for military purposes, and therefore we further assumed, because the authority exists in the organic act, that if the lands were no longer needed for military purposes that the War Department would return the lands to us.

Mr. COLLINS. I have no special objection to this bill, but it seems hardly fair to ask that these funds go into the treasury of the islands and then provide for the Federal Treasury to pay the salaries of their legislative officers.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That has not been done in case of any other Territory of the United States. That is a correct statement with respect to every Territory before it came in; that the Territory did not pay the salaries of the legislative officers.

Mr. COLLINS. That is no reason why we should retain a law that is wrong. Let us change it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report shows that this property is owned by the Government and that the Government has need for it. It lets it temporarily. I presume that this condition exists with respect to other property. Why should the Government turn over this measly sum of \$7,000? May I ask the gentleman if this bill originated with the Territory?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It did not. The organic act provided that the salaries of the legislative officers should be paid by the National Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it is too small a matter for the Territory to come here and ask for, in view of the possible inconvenience to the department. Seven thousand dollars is not much for the islands to pay. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

THE EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETS

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 2152.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed the House in support of H. R. 2152, known as the Ketcham bill, which provides for the appointment of agents of the Department of Agriculture, whose duties will be to seek new foreign markets for American farm commodities. I called attention to the fact that Congress had, by appropriate legislation, created a Foreign Commerce Service in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce, which is doing much to find an outlet for the products of American industrial plants, and which actually brings the American manufacturers into direct contact with prospective foreign customers.

The Ketcham bill proposes to do in a modest way for agriculture what has already been done in a generous manner for industry. One argument lodged against the pending bill is that the Foreign Commerce Service of the Department of Commerce can do this work for agriculture while carrying on its activities for industry.

In my former remarks I endeavored to show that the Foreign Service of the Department of Commerce is essentially an agency for the expansion and benefit of the American manufacturers; that its agents were largely drawn from the industrial classes, were saturated with industrialism, out of sympathy with agriculture, interested primarily in enlarging the markets for manufactured products; and that they had not given and would not give to agriculture the effort and attention they were giving to the manufacturers. I have insisted that as long as the Department of Commerce has charge of our agricultural interests in foreign fields agriculture will undoubtedly get the worst of the deal.

The agricultural classes will see no substantial enlargement of their foreign markets until we have a force of men in sympathy with agriculture, fully informed as to its needs, and enthusiastic for the expansion of its markets.

In my former address I quoted the Commerce Reports to show that the Department of Commerce and its Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce were essentially and primarily agents of the manufacturers to expand the market for manufactured commodities. I now desire to submit the following corroborative observations:

Each year the Secretary of Commerce calls attention in his report to what the Foreign Service agents of the Commerce Department have accomplished in finding markets for American commodities, but practically all of these are sales of manufactured products. Comparatively few new markets have been found for agricultural commodities. Only now and then does the Commerce Department claim credit for having found an outlet for the products of American farms. These agents are sent to localities where the people are more interested in the output of American factories than they are in grain and other agricultural commodities. I am stating facts, and in support of my contention I call your attention to the official reports of the Department of Commerce in relation to the activities and accomplishments of that bureau in finding foreign markets for American commodities.

In the 1927 annual report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, made by Director Klein to Secretary Hoover, it was said:

It is, of course, impossible to calculate accurately the amount of business secured for American firms and of losses prevented in their behalf by the bureau's foreign offices. Nevertheless, an interesting indication of the dollars-and-cents value of these offices is afforded by this fact: A number of firms constituting only a small percentage of our regular clientele has voluntarily testified to a total of \$16,089,254 as the value of business which they obtained or losses which they avoided through the activities of the foreign office during the fiscal year just ended. This, it should be emphasized, is only a partial figure. . . . The sum mentioned does not take into account several millions of dollars that have been indubitably saved or repaid to American firms through the effort of bureau representatives in bringing about a more favorable treatment of American merchandise, helping to adjust dis-

putes between American firms and their foreign connections, forestalling tendencies that might have been highly damaging to established lines of this Nation's foreign-trade activity, or through many other concrete services of actual dollars-and-cents value.

These statements, typical of many others, very clearly establish the fact that the foreign agents of the Commerce Department devote their time and energies almost exclusively to aiding American manufacturers find new markets for American factory-made goods. This brings a multitude of new customers for our factory products and adds millions of dollars to the income and profits of the industrial classes of the United States. These Commerce Department representatives act as selling agents of the manufacturers, and as Uncle Sam pays their salaries and expenses the industrialists are reaping rich harvests in profits on this foreign trade that our Government gets for them.

Continuing, Mr. Klein, in his report, said:

The following examples of dollars-and-cents services to American business by the personnel of the bureau's foreign officers are representative, although no attempt is made to present anything like a complete picture of the work accomplished at any given station:

After the field representative of a Detroit automobile manufacturer had paid unsuccessful visits to Batavia, Dutch East Indies, over a period of two years, the American trade commissioner obtained for him a local dealer, who is now buying cars to the value of \$10,000 a month.

An important American cotton-goods house, with the advice and assistance of the bureau's trade commissioner at Batavia, did about \$80,000 worth of business in five months in a market in which the introduction of American textiles is particularly difficult because the agencies for distribution usually have foreign affiliations and are averse to handling competitive American lines.

Here follows a statement of many, many instances where the agents of the Commerce Department had succeeded in finding customers and making sales of American machinery and merchandise, as follows:

One million six hundred and twenty thousand dollars' worth of American manufactured products in Berlin.

Five thousand five hundred dollars' worth of artificial leather sold in Berlin.

Twelve thousand dollars' worth of automobile accessories and implements sold in Berlin.

Three hundred thousand dollars' worth of lubricating systems sold in Germany in three months.

Twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of printing machinery sold in Germany.

Eight thousand five hundred dollars' worth of road-making machinery sold in Germany.

Thirty-two thousand dollars' worth of cyanide sold to the Argentine Government.

Five thousand dollars' worth of hosiery sold in Buenos Aires.

Ironed-out difficulties in Cairo, Egypt, thereby preserving a Detroit motor-car company investment of more than \$1,000,000.

Forty-two thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in Egypt.

Twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of piece-goods merchandise sold in Bombay.

Ten thousand dollars' worth of chemicals sold in Calcutta in five months.

Twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of cigarettes sold in Calcutta in 10 months.

Twenty-two thousand dollars' worth of automobile parts sold in Bombay.

American rubber footwear sold in Denmark.

Ten thousand dollars' worth of automobile tires sold in Denmark.

Twenty-one thousand dollars' worth of hosiery sold in Hamburg.

One hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in Finland.

Six thousand dollars' worth of outboard motors and \$25,000 worth of jute bags and burlaps sold in Finland.

Effectuated a reorganization of two American business firms in South Africa with a turnover of approximately \$1,500,000.

Fifty thousand dollars' worth of printing machinery and \$5,000 worth of builders' hardware sold in Peru.

Twenty thousand dollars' worth of car-washing machinery.

Forty-one thousand dollars' worth of textiles.

Forty thousand dollars' worth of yarns, \$50,000 worth of well-drilling machinery, \$50,000 worth of specialties, and \$170,000 worth of automobile and radio equipment sold in London.

One hundred and ten thousand dollars' worth of leather sold in London.

Protected an American oil company's investment in Spain amounting to \$1,500,000.

Sold more than \$1,000,000 of electric cars in Spain.

Protected the American Shoe Machinery Co.'s business in Spain amounting to several hundred thousand dollars.

Three hundred thousand dollars' worth of paper machinery sold in Madrid.

Ten thousand five hundred and seventy-seven dollars' worth of brass manufactures sold in Manila.

Six thousand five hundred dollars' worth of cement-making machinery sold in Manila.

Obtained electrical contracts in Australia valued at \$39,614.

Brought about the purchase of \$250,000 worth of American material for the construction of a new hotel in Melbourne, Australia.

Sold \$56,630 worth of traction engines in Australia.

Seventy-five thousand dollars' worth of canning machinery sold in Mexico.

Twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of motor trucks and \$10,000 worth of lumber sold to Uruguayan buyers.

Sold \$5,000 worth of wall paper and \$300,000 worth of manufactured novelties in Montreal.

Saved exporters of fire brick to Canada \$750,000 by securing exemption from Canadian marketing requirements.

Sold \$100,000 worth of merchandise to 22 Canadian stores.

Sold \$74,000 worth of miscellaneous merchandise in Ottawa.

Seven thousand nine hundred and seventeen dollars' worth of bathing suits in Paris, and \$104,000 worth of piece goods in the Philippines.

Protected an investment of American motion-picture firms in Czechoslovakia, representing an annual return of \$600,000.

Sold \$47,469 worth of automobiles in Brazil.

Three hundred thousand dollars' worth of automobiles and \$8,000 worth of builders' supplies in Italy.

Helped American airplane companies to sell \$200,000 worth of airplanes to the Chilean Government.

Sold \$128,000 worth of automobiles in Chile.

Secured a contract for the sale of automobile tires in Austria amounting to \$200,000 annually, having induced the dealer to discontinue selling European brands and handle American products.

In this entire list of transactions promoted by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce only four items are mentioned which would be of interest or benefit to the American farmers, namely, \$4,500 worth of cattle sold in Cuba, \$100,000 worth of fruit exported to Argentina, \$40,000 worth of lard sold in Peru—the principal profit therefrom going to the packers—and \$100,000 worth of raw cotton sold in Sweden. No one can read these reports and escape the conviction that practically all the activities of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce relate to matters in which the manufacturing and commercial classes of the United States are interested and which do not directly or indirectly concern the American farmers.

I now call your attention to the 1929 report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The director of the bureau calls attention to the activities of its foreign agents and the dollars-and-cents returns accruing to the business public from such activities. He said:

Highly satisfactory growth continues to be shown in the dollars-and-cents return obtained by American business firms through the bureau's trade-promotive work, a statement borne out not only by the substantial sums involved but by the wide diversity of achievements reported.

The report then enumerates instances where the foreign agents of the Commerce Department succeeded in finding customers in foreign lands for American commodities; but in almost every instance these transactions related to commodities produced in American factories, and very few of them related either directly or indirectly to agricultural products, as the following synopsis of his report will show:

Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of airplanes and equipment sold in Chile.

One hundred thousand dollars' worth of aluminum ware sold in Canada.

Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in Brazil.

Eight hundred thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in Turkey.

Sixty thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in South Africa.

Two hundred and twenty-eight thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in Chile.

Forty thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in Netherland East Indies.

Fifteen thousand dollars' worth of automobiles sold in Panama and Colombia.

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of cars sold in Japan.

Three million five hundred thousand dollars' worth of Detroit automobiles sold in 15 foreign countries.

Three hundred thousand dollars' worth of automobile accessories from 19 American firms sold in Australia.

Thirty thousand dollars' worth of motor trucks sold in Canada.

Seventy-five thousand dollars' worth of baking equipment sold in New Zealand.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of doughnut machinery sold in Canada.

Sixty thousand dollars' worth of brass goods sold in Australia.

Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of building equipment and machines sold in Canada.

Fifty thousand dollars' worth of architectural steel and \$20,000 worth of sheet-metal building specialties sold in Canada.

Ninety-one thousand dollars' worth of canning machinery sold in Germany.

Three million dollars' worth of chemicals sold in Germany.

Ten thousand dollars' worth of coal sold in Canada.

One hundred and twenty thousand dollars' worth of milk-handling equipment sold in Brazil.

Sixty thousand dollars' worth of drills sold in India.

Five hundred and eighty-eight dollars' worth of electrical equipment sold in Paris.

One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of flour-mill machinery sold in Mexico and Europe.

Five hundred thousand dollars' worth of general groceries sold in the Philippines.

Ten thousand dollars' worth of fountain pens sold in Austria.

Thirty thousand dollars' worth of glassware sold in Panama.

One hundred and forty-five thousand dollars' worth of hardware from 22 American manufacturers sold in the Australian market.

Forty thousand dollars' worth of oil heaters sold in Canada.

Eighty thousand dollars' worth of X-ray equipment sold in Rumania.

Eighteen thousand dollars' worth of hospital equipment sold in Egypt.

Three hundred thousand dollars' worth of manufactured leather sold in Sweden.

Three thousand dollars' worth of manufactured leather sold in China.

Seventy-five thousand dollars' worth of leather sold in Belgium.

Twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of leather sold in Canada.

Fifty thousand dollars' worth of shoes sold in South America.

Ten thousand dollars' worth of farm lighting sets sold in Canada.

Three hundred thousand dollars' worth of lumber sold in Germany.

One hundred and ten thousand dollars' worth of lumber sold in Panama.

Two hundred and five thousand dollars' worth of lumber sold in 19 foreign nations.

Eighteen thousand dollars' worth of lumbering machinery sold in Japan.

Sixty thousand dollars' worth of motor cycles sold in Egypt, Poland, and Brazil.

Fifty thousand dollars' worth of accounting machines sold in Sweden.

Fifty thousand dollars' worth of typewriters sold in Turkey.

Twenty-seven thousand dollars' worth of dictaphones sold in Newfoundland and the Straits Settlements.

Twenty-three thousand dollars' worth of adding machines sold in Czechoslovakia.

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of oil-well machinery sold in Argentina.

Twenty-eight thousand dollars' worth of paints sold in Manila.

Twenty thousand dollars' worth of white lead sold in Holland.

Three hundred thousand dollars' worth of paints and roofing sold in Latin-America.

Thirty-five thousand dollars' worth of paper and paper goods sold in South Africa.

One hundred thousand dollars' worth of wrapping paper sold in Porto Rico.

Ten thousand dollars' worth of paper sold in New Zealand.

Two hundred thousand dollars' worth of lubricating oils sold in Paris.

One hundred thousand dollars' worth of plumbing equipment sold in Brazil.

Fifteen thousand dollars' worth of plumbing equipment sold in Peru.

Fifty thousand dollars' worth of binding machinery sold in Hungary.

Fifty thousand dollars' worth of linotypes sold in Finland.

Fifteen thousand dollars' worth of printing ink sold in Brazil.

Ten thousand dollars' worth of printing equipment sold in Panama.

Assisted in securing contracts for a New York firm for the construction of two dams in Chile involving a consideration of \$1,057,000.

Assisted a Massachusetts firm in securing a paving contract in South America involving \$1,700,000.

Sold a conveyor system for \$500,000 in South America.

Sold \$12,500 worth of centrifugal pumps in Mexico.

Sold \$200,000 worth of radio sets and accessories in Canada.

Sold \$74,000 worth of electric refrigerators in Rumania, \$60,000 in Brazil, and \$15,000 in India.

Sold \$375,000 worth of concrete mixers, cranes, and power shovels in Spain and Brazil.

Sold \$14,000 worth of gasoline-driven shovels in Rio de Janeiro.

Sold \$125,000 worth of road machinery in Uruguay.

Sold \$198,000 worth of rubber goods in Sweden, Austria, and Egypt.

Sold \$110,000 worth of salt in British Columbia.

Sold \$100,000 worth of sewer pipe in Canada.

Sold \$80,000 worth of smoke consumers in Hungary.
 Sold \$105,000 worth of laundry soap in Porto Rico.
 Eighty thousand dollars' worth of soda fountains in Germany; and thirty-five thousand dollars' worth of soda fountains in Brazil.
 Sold \$30,000 worth of alloy steel in Brazil.
 Thirty-five thousand dollars' worth of sugar-mill machinery in Brazil.
 One hundred and seventy thousand dollars' worth of bathing suits in Berlin.
 One hundred and ninety thousand dollars' worth of textiles in Canada.
 Eighty-five thousand dollars' worth of cotton duck in Singapore.
 Ninety thousand dollars' worth of piece goods in Malaysia.
 Twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of towels in Chile.
 One hundred and ninety thousand dollars' worth of knitted and piece goods in Egypt; and one hundred and five thousand dollars' worth of textiles in India.
 One hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of theater seats in the Straits Settlements.
 One hundred and ten thousand dollars' worth of theatrical goods in sundry markets.
 Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of thermometers, controllers, and gages in Latin America.
 Two hundred and twenty thousand dollars' worth of tires in Finland, Spain, and Egypt.
 One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars' worth of tires in Austria, Rumania, and Spain.
 Sold \$450,000 worth of vacuum cleaners in Holland.
 Seventy thousand two hundred and fifty dollars' worth of wall board in India.
 One million dollars' worth of wall board in Denmark.
 Four hundred thousand dollars' worth of wall board in Rome.
 Sold \$20,000 worth of woodworking machinery in Czechoslovakia.
 Five hundred and twenty thousand dollars' worth of steel flooring, rail appliances, trailers, vacuum cleaning machinery, valves, and exhausters in Australia.
 Sold \$44,000 worth of radios, electrical goods, vending machines, grinding tools, wireless sets, and textiles in Australia.

No one can read the annual reports of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and not be impressed with the fact that probably as much as 95 per cent of its activities are for the benefit of the American manufacturers, and comparatively small results are obtained in an effort to establish new markets for American farm commodities. The 1929 report gives the bureau credit for having assisted in selling in Germany \$400,000 worth of canned fruit and foods from California, Washington, and New York, but obviously these sales benefited the packing companies more than the growers of fruits and vegetables. The bureau claims to have aided in the selection of agencies in Great Britain, for the sale of American fruit juice, fruit, rice, and canned goods; and here again the lion's share of the profits went not to the farmers and growers but to those who packed or processed these products.

Credit is also claimed for having assisted in the sale of \$200,000 worth of flour in China, and obviously the profits from this transaction found their way into the pockets of the millers. The bureau claims to have been instrumental in bringing about the sale of \$89,000 worth of meat products in Venezuela, and in saving \$30,000, in tariffs on a meat shipment from Illinois to Europe, and undeniable, the profits from these transactions went to the packers, and probably not a single penny was reflected in an increased price that the farmer received for the raw material.

In this 1929 report, a letter is quoted from an airplane manufacturer, who said:

We encountered very strong and extremely well-organized competition in Chile. The work of the commercial attaché in Santiago was of the utmost help to us in closing a contract covering about \$750,000 worth of airplanes and equipment.

This illustrates what the Foreign Service agents of the Commerce Department are doing for manufacturers.

The report shows that in one instance the commercial attaché at Constantinople suggested to a Turkish firm that they buy American automobiles and pressed the matter so aggressively that the firm bought \$800,000 worth of American automobiles in two years.

An American manufacturer of electrical equipment wrote the bureau:

Had you not been able to assist me in this matter, the order (for \$588,000 worth of electrical equipment) would have gone to a European competitor.

The bureau's agent at Shanghai, by the use of the radio, sold \$83,000 worth of American leather. These reports show many similar instances where the foreign agents of the Commerce Department have been able to find markets for millions of dol-

lars' worth of American factory-made commodities. Primarily, these agents were appointed for that purpose, and they are doing a good job and rendering efficient service.

Now, by the pending bill, H. R. 2152, we are trying to have the Government give the Department of Agriculture a few men who, in foreign fields, will seek new markets for American farm products and try to do for agriculture what the Foreign Service agents of the Commerce Department are doing for the manufacturing classes in America.

In 1929 shipments of American merchandise abroad exceeded \$5,000,000,000, one-half larger than the United Kingdom's exports of British goods and three-fourths greater than Germany's domestic exports. It may be interesting to note that we sell abroad one-eighth of our total farm commodities and one-tenth of the products of our factories. We can not afford to lose or even look with indifference upon our foreign commerce, without which a vast army of workmen would be thrown out of employment. The effect would be felt in every line of industry.

We have reached the point of saturation, and the American people are no longer able to absorb all the production that comes from our farms and factories. We must not only hold our present foreign trade, but we must diligently seek new outlets which will absorb our surplus production, bringing to us a very considerable part of the wealth of other nations and afford remunerative employment to thousands or millions of men who, without our foreign trade, would be idle.

The farmers of the world have never produced a surplus of agricultural commodities. For every pound of foodstuffs produced there are somewhere hungry mouths and empty stomachs to consume it. With better facilities for transportation and distribution all the so-called surplus food products of the world would be consumed. In a limited area there may be an overproduction, but if we had proper facilities for transportation and distribution of these surplus food products the world would consume them and cry for more. There are millions of people in foreign lands who would be only too glad to get our farm products if ways and means could be devised to bring our farm commodities within their reach. The Department of Commerce has been very diligent and successful in creating a demand in foreign lands for our manufactured products and in facilitating their transportation and distribution. In a modest way, I think the pending bill will materially help the American farmers along the same lines.

The foreign demand for our finished manufactures has been growing by leaps and bounds, amounting to \$2,509,000,000 during the fiscal year of 1929. This was 22 per cent larger than in the preceding year and 107 per cent larger than in the fiscal year of 1922. It is significant that the greatest gains during recent years have been in motor vehicles, machinery, chemicals, and other highly elaborated products. The activities of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce have contributed materially to this enormous increase in our exports of manufactured commodities. In the last report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce it was stated that the absence of our export market would be no small disaster to our economic life.

I quote from the 1929 report of the bureau:

DOLLARS-AND-CENTS RETURNS TO THE BUSINESS PUBLIC

Highly satisfactory growth continues to be shown in the dollars-and-cents returns obtained from American business firms through the bureau's trade-promotive work, a statement borne out not only by the substantial sums involved but by the wide diversity of achievements reported.

It will be noticed that these dollars-and-cents returns are to "the business public" or "American business firms." Nothing is said about dollars-and-cents returns to farmers. The Department of Commerce does not speak the language of agriculture.

The report continues:

Aid in the selection of suitable foreign connections (one of the most helpful contributions the bureau has made to the expansion of American export trade) produced to a large extent the results on which a money value could be placed. However, only a part of the actual benefits each year becomes known, for the bureau is not informed in all instances in which business or savings accrued from its efforts. Many of the services rendered, such as preventing American firms from dealing with unreliable and incompetent importers, or from expending time and money to introduce articles that could not be marketed in a particular area chosen, and counsel given preparatory to offering goods in foreign countries, though of major importance, are not computable in dollars and cents.

That is to say, the commercial agent of the Commerce Department in foreign lands acts as agent, representative, salesman, attorney, and wet nurse of the American manufacturing concerns.

Some of the activities of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce have undoubtedly been exceedingly injurious to American agriculture. I quote from the 1929 report:

In addition to developing markets for American goods, this office is now furnishing long-needed information on the production of cocoa and palm oil (of which West Africa is the principal world supplier), the importance of which data can be readily measured by the widespread and growing use of these products in the United States.

In other words, the foreign representatives of the Commerce Department are keeping the vegetable-oil producers in the United States informed as to where they can get adequate supplies of cocoa and palm oil and other vegetable oils which are now being brought into this country in enormous quantities, and which displace fats and vegetable oils produced in the United States. Indeed, the production and importation of vegetable oils has increased to such an extent as to almost destroy the market for lard, one of the most important commodities produced by the American farmer.

The zeal of the Department of Commerce in promoting the welfare of the American manufacturers is not confined to activities in the foreign field, but its agents visit our great industrial centers, confer with our manufacturers, and actively cooperate with them in the expansion of their foreign and domestic trade, as is clearly established by the last report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. I quote:

CLOSE CONTACT MAINTAINED WITH INDUSTRY

Direct contact with industry on the part of the Foreign Commerce Service is established through the extensive traveling in the United States of returned officers, who visit the principal industrial centers to confer with individuals and organizations interested in export trade. It is estimated that last year 12 industrial centers, on the average, were visited by each such officer, and that in each city, 20 or more interviews were had with firms and individuals, in addition to numerous addresses before chambers of commerce and other trade bodies.

As a result of such contacts, business executives are making greater use each year of the services available from these offices, particularly when traveling abroad. Evidence of this is found in the increasing number of letters of introduction (over 500 last year) given by Washington and district offices to American business men embarking for foreign countries—and, conversely, by our overseas offices to business men in their respective territories, contemplating a visit to the United States. More than 250 interested foreign buyers were thus introduced to Washington headquarters and the district offices, and interviews arranged for them with suitable manufacturers, to say nothing of the numerous trade delegations which visited this country and for which the bureau, at the request of Foreign Commerce offices, planned itineraries, or at least offered them the facilities of its district offices.

You will observe that the chief function of the Foreign Service of the Department of Commerce is to bring American manufacturers into contact with foreign individuals or firms who are prospective customers for the products of American factories. I do not criticize the Department of Commerce for aiding American manufacturers in finding new markets for their finished products, but my criticism is based on the failure of the Department of Commerce to do one one-hundredth part as much for agriculture as it is doing for industry.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce not only materially aids the American industrialists in finding new markets for their products but it performs many other functions of great value to the industrial groups. It adjusts misunderstandings and disputes between our American manufacturers and their customers abroad, assists in collecting overdue accounts, adjusts claims, frequently secures favorable tariff classifications, prevents discrimination against American merchandise, protects American trade-marks abroad, conducts foreign-trade meetings, and acts as a clearing house for information in reference to market and economic conditions.

In the language of the report, the bureau furnishes "concrete commodity service for American industries." There is a division devoted to each great manufactured commodity, namely, agricultural implements division, aeronautic section, automotive division, chemical division, electrical equipment division, hide and leather division, industrial machinery division, iron-steel hardware division, lumber division, minerals division, motion-picture section, paper division, rubber division, shoe and leather manufacturers' division, specialties division, textile division, commercial intelligence division, division of commercial laws, division of credits and distribution, editorial division, finance and investment division, division of foreign tariffs, division of statistical research, division of statistics, transportation division. This list reads like the roster of the United States Chamber of Commerce and includes all important industrial and commercial activities.

All of the foregoing divisions or sections are under the supervision of high-salaried experts, and all relate to activities in which our industrial classes are interested. It is true the bureau maintains a foodstuffs division, but the activities of this division seem to be directed more toward bringing foodstuffs into the United States rather than finding a foreign market for American farm products, as the following quotation from the 1929 bureau report will conclusively show. I quote:

FOODSTUFFS DIVISION

West Africa produces about two-thirds of the cocoa beans of the world; yet the American trade, which imports some \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 worth of this cocoa annually, has in the past had no direct information service covering the harvest or the factors that affect yield and price. One of the most important extensions of the foodstuffs division's work last year, accordingly, was the arranging for a very complete service of reports on this crop through the bureau's new office at Accra, Gold Coast.

Undeniably this work of the Foodstuffs Division of the bureau will not help the American farmer, because it encourages and facilitates importations of vegetable oils into the United States from abroad. These vegetable oils are being used more and more as substitutes for American butter and lard products. These importations are not only destroying our market for American lard, but by being used as a substitute for butter are injuriously affecting our dairy interests. They also come into direct competition with such vegetable oils as are produced in the United States. So the less active the Foodstuffs Division is in stimulating importations of vegetable oils into the United States the better it will be for the American farmer.

But, you may ask, "Why is the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce so much interested in finding foreign supplies of vegetable oils for importation into the United States?" The answer is obvious. The manufacturers of food products want these foreign vegetable oils as substitutes for American lard and American butter, and the Department of Commerce sees to it that the manufacturers get what they want, even at the expense of the American farmer.

According to the last report, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in 1929 rendered 3,342,118 services or 11,140 each business day. Practically all of these had to do with the business of the manufacturing classes, and comparatively few of them touched, either directly or indirectly, the interests of American agriculture. I have mentioned these matters in detail, in order to bring to your attention the undeniable fact that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is essentially an activity or agency of the American manufacturers, with barely a speaking acquaintance with agriculture. I repeat, I do not criticize the Department of Commerce for what it has done and is doing for industry, but I think the Department is subject to criticism for what it has failed to do for agriculture.

More and more each year the manufacturer is becoming the petted, pampered, and spoiled child of Uncle Sam, who continues to treat agriculture as a stepchild. I am not complaining about what has been done for industry and commerce, but I insist that more should be done for agriculture, the first and greatest of all basic industries. While the one should be aided in every right way, relief for the other should not be denied.

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11679) to extend hospital facilities to certain retired officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill covers two distinct and separate subject matters. We had an instance of that this morning, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] referred to. A bill was amended which could not be found in the statutes.

I would suggest that we take the bill as it is, the first part, and strike out section 2 and all the other sections. Then that will be one bill, and the author can get unanimous consent of the House, I am sure, to consider the other subject in a separate bill.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment which I wish to present for the information of the House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That has nothing to do with my objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNELL: Page 1, line 4, after the word "available," insert the words "at the same cost conformably to the retired officers and men in other branches of the Government service."

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman has in his mind, but I think it is available to every other branch of the service now.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a limitation as to the cost of service to be applied to these light keepers and assistant light keepers.

Mr. MERRITT. I see no objection to that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I shall make a point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment is offered for the information of the House.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is not the bill now under consideration, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. MERRITT. I have no objection to the amendment, but as to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], I may say that I have consulted with him, and also with the Speaker yesterday, and consequently I would propose, in accordance with the gentleman's suggestion, that the first section of the bill be stricken out and the title changed to conform to the remaining section, the number of these sections to be changed. I also, with the consent of the committee, prepared another bill embodying only section 1 of the present bill, word for word, and I am authorized by the committee to offer that, so that if by unanimous consent the first bill is passed, striking out the first section, I will offer the other bill. That will meet the objection of the gentleman from New York, which I admit has a good foundation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the House should be acquainted with the substance of the substitute.

Mr. MERRITT. It is an exact copy of section 1 of the bill before the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not inclined to favor the transfer of public property to a private organization which is authorized to charge admission.

Mr. MERRITT. The reason for that is that the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities is already in existence and has heretofore done fine work in regard to marking and preserving historical sites in Virginia. There will be some expense involved in keeping this old lighthouse in order, and we believe it will receive more attention in this way than by letting it go as has been the case all these years, so that it will gradually be destroyed by time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information which is not given in the report, as to its historic significance?

Mr. MERRITT. The only historic significance is that it was the first lighthouse constructed on this continent. It is the oldest lighthouse on this continent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman has fair assurance that the authorization providing for the charging of a reasonable fee for admission to this antiquity will not be burdensome, but simply sufficient to maintain the lighthouse?

Mr. MERRITT. I have every assurance to that effect. This society is a patriotic society and not operated for gain at all.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What is the big idea of the provision of section 4 donating this land to the so-called Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, and so forth? What kind of an association is this?

Mr. MERRITT. It is an association similar to that which has been operating Mount Vernon for many years. It already is in existence and has charge of many other historical antiquities. It is not a society for gain, as I told the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What is the value of this property?

Mr. MERRITT. It has no commercial value. It only has historic value.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If we turn it over to the National Park Bureau we will have to have 3 or 4 watchmen there and 2 supervisors, and a speech by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That is all right, but there must be some value to this property.

Mr. MERRITT. No commercial value.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How large is it?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. This Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities is composed of the

leading patriotic women of our State who try to preserve these ancient memorials. This old lighthouse is on the spot at which John Smith and his expedition landed. This is the first lighthouse built on this continent. The land has absolutely no commercial value. It is a sand pile. A new lighthouse has been erected near it. I do not suppose it has any practical value at all. It is just the old site with this lighthouse erected on it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Since the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has brought me into the discussion, I know something about this Cape Henry matter. It is an historic point of great interest, and this society has done a great deal of patriotic work.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is the department now operating a lighthouse at this particular place?

Mr. MERRITT. Oh, no. It has not for 50 years.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Within probably a hundred yards of it is another lighthouse, a new one, but this is the old abandoned lighthouse. It has not been used for 40 or 50 years.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Do you believe that in the future they might want to expand the present lighthouse and would need this property located 100 yards from where the new one is now?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Oh, no. It will never be used.

Mr. CRAMTON. A very notable celebration is held at this point every year. I think something like 5,000 people were there this year, commemorating this historical event.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The people through such organizations in the State of Virginia can find more ways of getting more land and appropriations from the Federal Government than any other 10 States in the Union, but, since our park expert, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] approves of this bill, and since I follow him on park questions because he is generally right, although he is all wrong on another fundamental question, the prohibition problem, I shall not object.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Why does the gentleman strike out section 1 with reference to the benefits?

Mr. MERRITT. I am going immediately to reintroduce that in another bill, and ask unanimous consent to pass it.

Mr. BRIGGS. What assurance has the gentleman that he will get unanimous consent to pass the other bill?

Mr. MERRITT. I think I will, because it is the same bill as this. It is not different.

Mr. BRIGGS. Why not leave it like it is?

Mr. MERRITT. The point is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] objects to the bill if it is left in. That is all. I do not object. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] says that the bill covers two unrelated subjects.

Mr. BRIGGS. There is no objection if they are separated?

Mr. MERRITT. No, sir.

Mr. BRIGGS. How does the gentleman expect to get the other bill considered to-day?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We have already arranged for the parliamentary procedure.

Mr. BRIGGS. I am interested in having it passed.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. PALMER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I notice in the bill it is stated "and shall be open to the public at reasonable times and on reasonable terms."

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Then there will be admission charged to see this?

Mr. MERRITT. There may be; yes, sir.

Mr. PALMER. This is a private matter for speculation purposes by private individuals, is it?

Mr. MERRITT. Oh, no; it is not. This society is not a society organized for gain at all. It is the same sort of society, as I said before, that is taking care of Mount Vernon.

Mr. PALMER. The bill further provides for the maintaining and making of repairs to water mains, and so on?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. At the expense of the Government?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They are our water mains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hospital and out-patient facilities of the Public Health Service shall be available, under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, to light keepers and assistant light keepers (who during their

active service were entitled to medical relief at hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service), and officers and crews of vessels of the Lighthouse Service, who have been or who may hereafter be retired under the provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 763), and of acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT: Page 1, line 3, strike out all of page 1 down to and including line 7 on page 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise—

(1) A suitable site for a lighthouse depot at or in the vicinity of Seattle, Wash.; and

(2) Such additional land contiguous to the present site of the lighthouse depot at Chelsea, Mass., as may be necessary to care for the increased activities of such depot.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, to strike out the clause "Sec. 2," and substitute therefore the word "That."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAFFORD moves to amend on page 2, line 8, by striking out the clause "Sec. 2" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "That."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to number the sections to correspond with the action on the first amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1929, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase the necessary land to be used as sites for lighthouse depots (1) at Newport, R. I., or elsewhere on Narragansett Bay; (2) at Portland, Me.; and (3) at or in the vicinity of Rockland, Me."

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, subject to the conditions hereinafter specified, the land constituting the site for the Old Light Tower at Cape Henry, Va., described by metes and bounds as follows, shown on blue print of drawing No. 306, dated January 31, 1925, on file in the office of the Superintendent of Lighthouses, Baltimore, Md.: Beginning for the same at Point A, which Point A is south 20° west 55.75 feet from the center of Old Light Tower and running thence north 70° west 135 feet to B; thence north 20° east 265 feet more or less to C; thence along the south side of the 10-foot concrete road to the intersection at D; thence along the south side of 18-foot military road to E; thence south 20° west 19 feet more or less to F; thence north 70° west 385 feet to A, the point of beginning, containing approximately 1.77 acres of land, together with the abandoned lighthouse tower thereon, reserving to the United States a right of way for the water main now running through such site, together with the right of ingress and egress to the valve on such water main and for the purpose of maintaining and making repairs to such water main.

The property herein authorized to be conveyed shall be preserved by such association solely for its historic interest, and shall be open to the public at reasonable times and on reasonable terms. The deed executed by the Secretary under the provisions of this section shall contain the express condition that if such association shall at any time cease to carry out the provisions of this section, or shall at any time use such property or permit its use for other purposes, or shall attempt to alienate such property, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

EXTENSION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES TO CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 12447, which em-

bodies the paragraph which has been stricken out of the bill just passed. It is the first paragraph which was stricken out because it was unrelated to the rest of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Has this been introduced as a separate bill?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes. I did this yesterday at the suggestion of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 12447, to extend hospital facilities to certain retired officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service and to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hospital and out-patient facilities of the Public Health Service shall be available, under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, to light keepers and assistant light keepers (who during their active service were entitled to medical relief at hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service), and officers and crews of vessels of the Lighthouse Service, who have been or who may hereafter be retired under the provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 763), and of acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill which the gentleman has presented is not on the Consent Calendar. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he does this at the suggestion of the Speaker?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This bill simply contains section 1 of the bill which was on the Consent Calendar and which was reported by the committee. It is the section stricken out of the bill just adopted because the bill contained two separate and distinct matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Has this bill been reported by the committee?

Mr. MERRITT. It has been reported by the committee to-day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT. It was passed on by the committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It was reported by the committee, because exactly the same provision was section 1 of the bill just considered by the House. It simply separates two propositions which the committee combined in one bill.

Mr. O'CONNELL. By mistake.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know whether it was by mistake or not.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It was a legislative mistake.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Has the bill a number?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes; it is H. R. 12447.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But it is not a bill that has ever been reported by the committee?

Mr. MERRITT. The committee reported it to-day.

Mr. TILSON. But that is not necessary at all. By unanimous consent we often present resolutions from the floor and pass them immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But the bill is not on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. TILSON. Bills are often taken up that are not on the Consent Calendar, and it has been done to-day in a number of instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNELL: Page 1, line 4, after the word "available," insert "at the same cost applicable to retired officers and men in other branches of the Government service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The committee was discharged from further consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT TO PROVIDE A GOVERNMENT FOR THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 11134) to amend

section 91 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended, was objected to, return to the bill, and have it passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 11134 was objected to, return to the same, and have it passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN GRAIN ELEVATORS AND GRAIN FIRMS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to amend Public Resolution No. 80, Seventieth Congress, second session, relating to payment of certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the original resolution was up the gentleman from North Dakota will recall we had a great deal of labor over it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And at that time assurance was given to me and to the House, on January 21, 1929, to be found on page 1991 of the RECORD of that day, that the purpose of the resolution was to permit the Comptroller General to make an audit with existing records, and upon this assurance the resolution passed this House. Now you come back and say, "We have not got the records, let them make the audit without the records." Certainly this was not the intention of the House when the original resolution was passed.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, it was believed at that time that all the records were available.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly.

Mr. SINCLAIR. We find that at the time the claims were incurred the Government was in charge of not only the railroads but the elevators also.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly.

Mr. SINCLAIR. And since that time the records that should be available have been destroyed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Not by any fault of the claimants but through the fault of the Government itself.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no, no, no. The report says that these little fellows did not keep their records and this resolution was passed on the understanding that these claims could be established by the books now in the possession of the Government.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is true, and the amounts of these claims have all been established. The weekly reports disclose precisely what each claimant has due him right on the books of the Government.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. BURTNESS. I think the gentleman from New York does not fully appreciate the only proof that seems to be lacking in these cases, as I understand it. The claims made weekly by the different companies are on file and constitute a part of the records here, but under the resolution that is now the law, in order for the comptroller to pay the claims my understanding is that he has taken the position that these various claimants must not only show that the claims were filed here in the offices of the Grain Corporation but they must show also, as the gentleman will find if he will turn to page 2 of the report—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is exactly what I have in my hand.

Mr. BURTNESS. Let me read this so the gentleman may get an understanding of it:

This involved making a showing that the weekly reports had been made.

This is conceded has been done, and the next clause is the material one for this bill:

That call had been made upon the carrier for cars for the transportation of the wheat, and refused, so as to require the wheat to be held and not shipped.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Now read the next sentence, please.

Mr. BURTNESS. All right.

The long lapse of time appears to have made it impossible for the claimants to produce this essential data.

Now let us see what is lacking.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All right.

Mr. BURTNESS. The report has gone in each particular week to the Government during the time that these contracts were in effect. That report cites that they have made demand upon the railroad companies that cars were not available, and so forth, so that under the provisions of the contract they were

entitled to be paid for their storage; but, of course, obviously, the actual demand made upon the railroad company for a car and the refusal by the railroad company to furnish a car was not sent in to the Government. The report advises of the action without further proof.

Now, it seems ridiculous for the accounting officer or anyone else to require at this date the detailed proof that can be furnished only from the records of the railroad companies with respect to proceedings that happened 12 years ago on these small claims.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman can not belittle this proof. It is the very proof you need.

Mr. COLLINS. And they can not furnish it and now they are asking the Government to waive it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. First you say, "Give us an audit on our records, and on the proof we have we will establish our claim." We say, "Good." You have the resolution passed and now you come and say, "Waive the proof."

Mr. BURTNESS. The fact is the way it was handled, generally speaking, by those companies who kept their books in the very best shape, as some of the large concerns could do, was that their word given in the weekly reports was accepted for these things.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Their what?

Mr. BURTNESS. My understanding is that when these claims were allowed to the larger concerns years ago the reports that came in with reference to these cars having been ordered and denied were accepted.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no; they proved their claims.

Mr. BURTNESS. Well, it is one thing to ask for proof at the time and another thing to ask for it 12 years later. The position of the proponents is that where the records show that the reports were made by the little elevator companies each week, that report showing that they made a demand on the railroad company for cars and the railroad company refused it, we take the position that that ought to be deemed sufficient without delving into the records of the railroad company, which apparently are not even obtainable at this time.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The gentleman knows that at the time this was established there was absolute control by the Government of both the railroads and the elevators, and they were delegating to each locality where they could ship and where they could not ship.

A MEMBER. The regular order!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is called for. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

TEMPORARY OR EMERGENCY STAR-ROUTE SERVICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5190) to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOPER. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill and I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois make a short explanation.

Mr. BUCKBEE. In reply to the gentleman from Michigan I will say that in the case of an emergency, such as the withdrawal of train service or some important emergency, the Post Office Department at the present time does not have the legal power to make contracts on the spot, so it leaves a space of time, say, from the 1st to the 5th of the month, where the service must be given by the Department, of course, but under the present law it can not be done, without causing the Department a lot of red tape.

Mr. HOOPER. And this bill seeks to span that space of four or five days?

Mr. BUCKBEE. Yes; it is simply to clarify that situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1916 (39 Stats. L. 161; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 434), is hereby amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

"Provided further, That the provisions of section 3960, Revised Statutes, that no compensation shall be paid for additional service in carrying the mail until such additional service is ordered, the sum to be allowed therefor to be expressed in the order and entered upon the books of the department, and that no compensation shall be paid for any additional regular service rendered before the issuing of such order, shall not apply to any service authorized under this act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT STATIONED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11371) to provide living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, for civilian officers and employees of the Government stationed in foreign countries.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Maryland wishes to make an explanation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is a policy being carried out by the United States Government, and it is only giving the little fellows the same chance and help that we are giving to the big ones.

Mr. COLLINS. I think charity begins at home, and if we are going to furnish living quarters, light, and heat to Government employees, we ought to furnish it to the employees of the Government who live in the United States.

Mr. O'CONNELL. We send them over there.

Mr. COLLINS. If we keep on boosting the salaries and perquisites of certain Government employees, we will have to pass a 12 hours a day law for civilians; otherwise they will not be able to support them.

Mr. O'CONNELL. They are officers of the Government.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; and we have officers of the Government living in the United States. Do you want to provide all of them with homes, heat, and light? Why pick out this class? Their services are not so worth while.

Mr. STAFFORD. And they are not living in localities where the cost of living is high. This is nothing but an increase-of-salary proposition.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Only a few days ago you passed a bill giving the same help to employees of the Department of Commerce living abroad.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; the gentleman confuses this with a bill we had the other day. That placed employees in the Foreign Commerce Service on the same parity so far as living conditions were concerned. Here you are giving them an additional salary. You are going wild in increasing salaries in the Foreign Service. A bill comes up to-morrow increasing the salaries greatly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to say to my colleague that when I lived abroad in the Foreign Service I lived in a furnished room, and I would not want anyone representing the Government of the United States to live the way I did.

Mr. COLLINS. You do not see but few resignations in this service. We passed the Rogers bill, which substantially raised their salaries. This bill gave these employees larger salaries than other Government employees in the other departments. I think we have been exceedingly generous with them already.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. The Army and Navy are provided with quarters.

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, yes. Other Government employees do not receive quarters. Let us treat them all alike from now on.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The turnover in resignations in the Foreign Service is over 100 per cent a year, and they are resigning from the service because they do not get decent salaries.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is just mistaken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PASSPORT BUREAUS AT PORTLAND AND LOS ANGELES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 235, authorizing an annual appropriation for the expense of establishing and maintaining a United States passport bureau at Portland, Oreg.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This resolution provides for additional passport bureaus in the cities of Portland and Los Angeles. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KORELL] has given this matter a great deal of time and consideration, but the question is whether we are going to establish passport bureaus all over the country. At the present time we have six—in New York, New Orleans, Seattle, San Francisco, and Chicago. As all know, passports are issued by the Department of State, by the Passport Bureau. If we authorize the opening of a passport bureau in Seattle and another in Los Angeles, then there is no reason why Galveston, St. Louis, Kansas City, Savannah, Milwaukee, should not have passport bureaus also.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I might suggest that Galveston is entitled to a passport bureau.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into a controversy with any other Member on the floor over the question whether his particular district is entitled to a service of this kind. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this resolution comes here with the unanimous report of the committee, and that it is reinforced by a letter that I received from the State Department, which includes this statement:

I am happy to say that the department has not the slightest objection to the creation of passport agencies at the places named as convenience to the traveling public, if the Congress should consider such agencies necessary and make provision for them.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman give the House some information about the testimony that appeared before the committee advocating the establishment of these two branches.

Mr. KORELL. I shall be very glad to do so. The city of Portland is located, by the very quickest means of transportation, some four and a half days from the Capital. In order to obtain a passport under the present conditions it is necessary for the applicant to make out his application with the clerk of the court at Portland, wait four and a half days until it arrives at Washington, and then four and a half days for its return to Portland. It ordinarily takes from 10 days to two weeks to obtain passport service, when it is applied for east of the Mississippi, and it takes a good deal longer time to obtain it when it is applied for from points that are west of the Mississippi.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And was not the evidence to the effect that the public on the Pacific coast would be greatly inconvenienced by the establishment of these passport offices?

Mr. KORELL. That is true.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And that there will be no inconvenience to the Government, and that the expense will be very slight?

Mr. KORELL. Nominal.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, the gentleman wants to be fair and the gentleman from Virginia also. He brushes aside the matter with the statement that the expense will be nominal. They will have to have an officer in charge, and there will be rent to pay, and a stenographer, and also fuel.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman is incorrect in his view of the matter of expense. The testimony before the committee, as I recall, was that the expense would be limited to about \$10,000.

Mr. KORELL. It will be about \$4,000 for the city of Portland. There is now being turned in to the State Department from Portland passport fees amounting to over \$8,000 a year for which we are given official credit. There is probably as much again that we are not credited with on account of the fact that applicants, in order to avoid delay and inconvenience, apply elsewhere or get their passport service here at Washington.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that the passport must be issued in Washington.

Mr. KORELL. I have no such information.

Mr. CRAMTON. The report overlooks the fact that since those first offices were established at San Francisco and Seattle, the air mail has come into use, and that very much shortens the time from the coast here.

Mr. KORELL. That is true.

Mr. CRAMTON. This bill would not be in the interest of the expansion of the air mail?

Mr. KORELL. That may be a means of speeding up the service to some extent, but the situation there now is this: The city of Los Angeles has spent over \$40,000,000 for its port and the city of Portland over \$30,000,000 for its port. Portland capital is now spending millions of dollars for the establishment of ship lines out of the port. Very recently they have undertaken to spend something in the neighborhood of \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 to establish another passenger line from Portland to the Orient.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman say that all of its passengers are from Portland?

Mr. KORELL. The fact of the matter is that in order to obtain a passport under present conditions the applicant must not only pay the \$10 fee but he is also subjected to an expense of from \$10 to \$15 for telephone and telegraphic charges to which the people in the Northeast are not now subjected. For over 1,200 miles on the Pacific coast there is only one passport

agency, while in the northeastern area of the United States, within just a few hours' distance of the Capital, there are four of these agencies established.

Now, so far as the question of service or convenience is concerned, it is much greater at the remote ports which incidentally need a little encouragement from the Congress in order to further develop the great foreign commerce that they are steadily building up for our country.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is it not a 36 hours' ride to San Francisco, the nearest point?

Mr. KORELL. Yes. It is all of that. But if you take into consideration the question of obtaining the record of birth and naturalization, sometimes these are not very clear or easily obtainable, and that in order to obtain a passport it is necessary to obtain such data you will appreciate the fact that a passport agency at San Francisco does not meet the existing requirements. Very frequently a man going to San Francisco to get a passport neglects to bring something that is necessary to enable him to get his passport. We are building up an export trade of a billion dollars on the Pacific coast. Our people are investing liberally in a merchant marine, and in order to foster and encourage foreign trade it is necessary to send traveling men across the water. Many times they have to leave in a hurry—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORELL. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the installation of this passport bureau is so important, why did not the State Department recommend it?

Mr. KORELL. For the simple reason that the State Department does not want to go on record as encouraging the establishment of these agencies all over the country. But as is shown by the contents of the letter that I have just quoted, they say that in cases where a good showing is made they have no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. They might as well have made an adverse report.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from Oregon ought to know that in the language of diplomacy the letter which he has read is a negative answer, or, in the parlance of the street, they are kidding you.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am not familiar with all the ways of the Diplomatic Service, but I think the passport bureaus are worthy of encouragement. The recent census has shown that. Unless you are going to confine to the Atlantic coast the favors which these men would afford in the promotion of business, this resolution should be passed in recognition of the importance of the Pacific coast.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Boston has one, and so has San Francisco.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would the gentleman be satisfied with having a provision made for service by the courts?

Mr. KORELL. That is about all that is provided by this bill, merely a passport form lodged with the clerk.

Mr. CRAMTON. I should think the establishment would mean more than the utilizing of the service of the courts.

Mr. KORELL. The idea is to have those men out there supplied with passport forms to deliver to applicants and with authority to extend and amend the same.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KORELL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Why should not the great cities of Texas be included in this bill? We have a thousand miles of coast line. The city of Houston has outgrown any city in the Northwest or the Southeast. Our population is over 300,000. We have a great many ships plying to all the ports of the world, and it would be a great convenience to us. [Applause.] I think that in the port cities the service ought to be given. The gentleman would not object to adding Houston to this, would he?

Mr. KORELL. I think it perhaps would not be wise to do so if we are to follow the rules that a proper case must be made out first before a committee.

Mr. GARRETT. The House has it in its discretion to do so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRAIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAIL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House, it has been erroneously stated in the course of this debate that

passport bureaus have no authority to issue passports and that passports can be issued only by the State Department at Washington, D. C.

It is true that in the ordinary course much of the work is sent to Washington for final execution, but in cases of emergency, or whenever great haste is required, passports can be and are executed at passport bureaus. Passports are also extended and renewed at passport bureaus.

Passport offices are now operated at Los Angeles and at Portland. This bill gives these offices the status of bureaus and the power, which they do not now have, of executing passports. So that you can readily see that the additional expense to the Government would be slight.

If a passport bureau is justified or necessary any place in the United States outside of the city of Washington, they are certainly justified at these two great ports of the Pacific coast. San Francisco has a passport bureau, but San Francisco is almost 500 miles from Los Angeles. Seattle has a passport bureau, but Seattle is 500 miles from Portland. Los Angeles, the great port of the Southwest, and Portland, the great port of the Northwest, in all fairness, should be given these advantages; I might say these necessities.

The fees paid into the passport office at Los Angeles now aggregate more than \$50,000 per year. If a passport bureau is established there the fees may increase to double that amount. Surely this bill will not work an economic loss to the Government.

The growth of Los Angeles and of all of the Southwest has been tremendous. You can scarcely realize this growth. One of our cities increased almost 2,500 per cent in population during the last 10 years. Los Angeles itself has grown 150 per cent during the last 10 years. When the census figures are announced, I predict they will show a greater increase than 150 per cent.

The increase of our Pacific coast trade as compared with the expansion of our Atlantic commerce during the past few years is shown in many recent reports compiled by the Secretary of Commerce.

An idea of the size of this increase can be obtained from the following report of the progress made by the 11 Western States. The total value of products for agriculture of that district rose from \$562,000,000 in 1909 to \$1,694,846,000 in 1928. The value of mineral products increased from \$354,000,000 in 1909 to \$1,046,000,000 in 1928, and the value of the manufactured products increased from \$1,208,000,000 in 1909 to \$4,595,102,000 in 1927.

In 1900 the total exports from our Pacific coast ports amounted to \$69,608,329. In 1928 the value had grown to \$557,860,000. Imports coming to our Pacific coast ports in 1900 were valued at \$58,401,381. In 1928 the value of imports was \$493,775,000. In 1928 the Pacific coast's combined volume of exports and imports, exclusive of Hawaii and Alaska, amounted to \$1,051,635,000, which was nearly ten times that of 1900 and three times that of 1913. The total exports of the United States as a whole in 1928 to Asia and Oceania amounted to \$834,547,000, and the imports to the United States as a whole from those sections of the Pacific area amounted to \$1,222,378,000, making a total value of trade between the United States, Asia, and Oceania of about \$2,056,925,000.

Due to the very substantial increase in our trans-Pacific trade many passenger steamship lines have been established and are now plying between west coast ports and Japan, China, Asiatic Russia, South America, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, Central America, and Canada.

The establishment and operation of these lines has greatly increased the passenger travel from all the western ports. This travel is an encouragement and aid to further development of our trans-Pacific and Asiatic trade.

Owing to the great distance between the west coast ports and the offices of the Department of State at Washington, D. C., considerable delay is experienced by travelers from these ports in obtaining passports. This delay is a discouragement to travel and therefore a handicap to Pacific coast trade.

Vigorous protests have been voiced by the people of Los Angeles and those living in the territory immediately adjacent to these ports against the time consumed and expense involved in obtaining passports in the regular course and through the authorized emergency procedure. In many cases the telephone and telegraph expenses have amounted to two or three times the amount of the passport fee, which at present is \$10. Ordinary mail between these two ports and Washington, D. C., is four and one-half days in transit both going and returning.

In obtaining a passport, one on the Pacific coast must make allowances for four weeks' or one month's time.

As my colleague from Oregon [Mr. KORELL] has stated the Committee on Foreign Affairs favorably reported this bill by a

unanimous vote. The State Department which would administer the law has stated over the signature of the Acting Secretary that it has no objection to the bill. There is no good reason why passport bureaus should not be established at these two Pacific-coast cities.

I sincerely trust that the bill will pass.

METERED PERMIT MATTER IN THE MAILS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8651) to authorize the dispatch from the mailing post office of metered permit matter of the first class, prepaid at least 2 cents but not fully prepaid and to authorize the acceptance of third-class matter without stamps affixed in such quantities as may be prescribed.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have had difficulty in subscribing to the principle that persons sending mail in wholesale quantities should be privileged to send it with postage underpaid.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask in behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], who is absent to-day, that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I make that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY OF POSTAL REVENUES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10344) to provide for the classification of extraordinary expenditures contributing to the deficiency of postal revenues.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11007) to amend the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, par. 7, 37 Stat. 555), making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913.

The title of the bill was read.

There being no objection to its present consideration, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, par. 7, 37 Stat. 555), making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, be amended to read as follows:

"All clerks appointed to the Railway Mail Service and to perform duty on railway post offices shall reside at some point on the route or at some point convenient thereto in the discretion of the general superintendent of the Railway Mail Service to which they are assigned; that railway postal clerks appointed prior to February 28, 1895, and now performing such duty shall not be required to change their residence except when transferred to another line."

With committee amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the figures "555" and insert the figures "556; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 631."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "assigned," strike out the semicolon and the word "that" and insert the words "Provided, That."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, par. 7, 37 Stat. 556; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 631), making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913."

CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP TO CERTAIN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10068) to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship to certain veterans of the World War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to point out that the bill gives authority to the Commissioner of Naturalization to issue a certificate in the case where a citizen lost his citizenship by reason of service in the army of a foreign country. In order to distinguish this certificate provided for in this bill from the regular certificate of citizenship, because a certificate of citizenship is issued by a court and a court alone, I would suggest that this certificate be called "a certificate of repatriation," which carries out the purpose of the bill, and it distinguishes it from the original certificate of citizenship, which must be issued by a court.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] understand that this bill proposes to vest power in a clerk of the Naturalization Bureau to administer the oath of allegiance instead of in the district court of the United States?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; but this refers to a former citizen who simply lost his citizenship on a technicality.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The point I wanted to call attention to is that power now vested in a Federal court is being vested in a deputy commissioner of naturalization.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Only in case of former citizens.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But why split the power of the court and give it to some clerks in the Naturalization Bureau? Why should they not go through the same process?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The report says:

Congress amended the naturalization act May 9, 1918, permitting all such citizens to resume their citizenship by taking the oath of allegiance to the United States in some court having jurisdiction over naturalization or before consuls of the United States if such veterans were abroad.

The record of such repatriation was certified to the Department of Labor and the Department of State, but no provision was made in the law for such veterans to obtain a certificate showing that they were again American citizens.

They obtain it by due process in the court, but what they need is a paper to show that they have done it. That is all there is to this bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not propose to object, but will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under the act of May 9, 1918, citizens who lost citizenship are permitted to resume their rights to become citizens by taking the oath in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; that is the law.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, it is proposed to amend the law so that they may take the oath of allegiance before a naturalization commissioner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. He gets a certificate. That is all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He has already been in court and got back his citizenship, which he temporarily lost while fighting.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In other words, he takes the oath in court?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He has taken the oath in court and he gets a paper to show that he has done it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not like to call this a certificate of citizenship, because I would like to distinguish it from the original certificate of citizenship which is issued by the court. Inasmuch as this is simply a certificate of repatriation, I would call it that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I suggest that we let it go over until I can ascertain about that exactly.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will be glad to let the bill pass and then the gentleman can consider it, and if it is not in proper form it can be amended on the other side.

Mr. BLOOM. It is not repatriation.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. A man who lost his citizenship is expatriated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There was a war and in that war Congress did permit people to take the oath of allegiance to that country and be excused.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly; and some of those men did not come in under the wire. They were expatriated by virtue of their war service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have no objection to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think it will clarify it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the twelfth subdivision of section 4 of the naturalization act of June 29, 1906, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"Any individual who claims to have resumed his citizenship under the provisions of this subdivision may, upon the payment of a fee of \$1, make application to the Commissioner of Naturalization, accompanied by two photographs of the applicant, for a certificate of citizenship. Upon proof to the satisfaction of the commissioner that the applicant is a citizen and that the citizenship was resumed as claimed, such individual shall be furnished a certificate of citizenship by the commissioner, but only if such individual is at the time within the United States. The certificate of citizenship issued under this subdivision shall have the same effect as a certificate issued by a court having naturalization jurisdiction, and the provisions of subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 33 shall apply in respect of proceedings and certificates of citizenship under this subdivision in the same manner and to the same extent, including penalties, as they apply in respect of proceedings and certificates of citizenship issued under such section."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] offers four amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "citizenship" and insert in lieu thereof the word "repatriation"; page 2, line 3, after the words "certificate of," strike out the word "citizenship" and insert the word "repatriation"; page 2, line 5, strike out the word "citizenship" and insert in lieu thereof the word "repatriation"; page 2, line 9, strike out the word "citizenship" and insert in lieu thereof the word "repatriation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is some doubt as to whether we should have two forms of certificate, one for naturalization and still another for repatriation, and whether we really mean repatriation in all of these cases, I am going to ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That stage has passed in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all proceedings on this bill thus far had be vacated and that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the proceedings thus far had in connection with the bill be vacated and the same go over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MONUMENTS TO MARK THE BIRTHPLACES OF DECEASED PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11582) to provide monuments to mark the birthplaces of deceased Presidents of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

ERECTION OF TABLETS OR MARKERS AND THE COMMEMORATION OF CAMP BLOUNT AND THE OLD STONE BRIDGE, LINCOLN COUNTY, TENN.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7924) for the erection of tablets or markers and the commemoration of Camp Blount and the Old Stone Bridge, Lincoln County, Tenn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have discussed this bill with the author, and he has said he would accept amendments which would confine the activity of the Government to the erection of the markers, but would not charge the Federal Government with the cost of maintenance or with the cost of acquiring land, and reducing the amount to \$10,000. With those amendments, I have no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to erect and maintain at Camp Blount, Lincoln County, Tenn., tablets or markers describing and commemorating the historical events which have taken place there, and to acquire the appropriate land therefor in the area of Camp Blount adjacent to the Jackson Highway.

Sec. 2. That in connection with Camp Blount the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept, upon behalf of the United States, a donation of and title to the historic and picturesque Old Stone Bridge crossing Elk River at the site of Camp Blount, together with the approaches thereto and any land adjoining said bridge; and to preserve and maintain said bridge and approaches and other lands, to erect appropriate tablets or markers, construct appropriate walks, and do necessary landscaping. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by purchase or gift such lands adjoining said bridge or approaches as may be reasonably required to properly commemorate the Old Stone Bridge and Camp Blount and to perpetuate the purposes of this act.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much of the sum of \$20,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "purchase," insert the words "or gift."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a series of amendments, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan offers a series of amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 1, line 3, strike out, at the end of the line, the words "and maintain."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the words "and to acquire the appropriate land therefor in the area of Camp Blount adjacent to the Jackson Highway."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time in the line, strike out the words "to preserve and maintain said bridge and approaches and other lands."

Page 2, line 8, after the word "markers," strike out the words "construct appropriate walks, and do necessary landscaping."

Page 2, line 10, strike out the words "purchase or."

Page 2, line 11, after the word "approaches," insert the words "or in the area of Camp Blount."

Page 2, line 17, strike out the figures "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$10,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS: Page 2, line 14, after the word "act," insert three new paragraphs, as follows:

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of War is authorized to do all things necessary to accomplish said purpose, by contract or otherwise, with or without advertising, under such conditions as he may prescribe, including the engagement, by contract, of services of such architects, sculptors, artists, or firms or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as he may deem necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States, and to spend in accordance with the provisions of this act such sum of money as may be placed in his hands as a contribution additional to the funds appropriated by Congress.

"Sec. 4. The plans and designs of such tablets or markers shall be subject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, or with the appropriate officials of the town of Fayetteville, the county of Lincoln, or the State of Tennessee, for the care and maintenance of the said tablets and markers, the Old Stone Bridge, and lands appertaining thereto: *Provided*, That such care and maintenance shall be without expense to the National Government."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy in this House recently—since we have had such an epidemic of bills providing for the erection of markers and the establishment of battle fields—to provide for maintenance, and I believe one of the distinguished Members on the gentleman's side of the House pointed out the desirability of making the arrangements with a subdivision of the State rather than with a private organization. Therefore I offer an amendment to the gentleman's amendment striking out the words "Daughters of the American Revolution" and leaving arrangements for maintenance to be made with the

county of Lincoln. I think that is the best policy, and we might as well have uniformity.

Mr. DAVIS. The amendment I offered—which was offered in an effort to meet the wishes of others—simply authorizes the Secretary of War to make an agreement with the local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, or with the appropriate officials of the town of Fayetteville, the County of Lincoln, or the State of Tennessee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is all right, but I move to strike out the words "with the local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution or."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA to the amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS: In the second line of section 5 strike out the words "with the local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution or."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS: Page 2, line 13, after the word "to" strike out the word "perpetuate" and insert in lieu thereof the word "effectuate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will renumber the paragraphs.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THREE HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] the need of \$10,000 for this purpose?

Mr. LUCE. This is the customary figure that has been placed in previous resolutions of the same sort. It is uncertain as yet whether this commission—

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUCE. Certainly. I was answering the gentleman from New York first.

It is uncertain whether this commission will be in attendance more than one day. It will expend only such amounts of money as are necessary for the traveling expenses of the commission, and undoubtedly a considerable part of the money would not be used if it were in attendance but one day. The program may take in, however, celebrations at other places in Massachusetts besides Boston.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The report states:

There has come from the State commission that is organizing and directing the celebration no requests for Federal funds, and those in authority have said that none will be needed. Therefore the accompanying bill has been restricted to the provision for a ceremonial commission that has become customary in the case of the more noteworthy anniversaries.

Does the gentleman think that \$10,000 ought to be authorized?

Mr. LUCE. As I point out, if the commission should pass several days in Massachusetts and travel over the State, as is quite possible, this amount of money would be needed. If not, the balance would be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It is customary when the Federal Government appoints a commission to attend a historical celebration for the Government to pay the expenses of the commission, is it not? Is not this the general rule?

Mr. LUCE. Oh, yes; that has always been done.

Mr. GREENWOOD. And this is no departure from the usual rule in that respect?

Mr. LUCE. Absolutely not. We have followed the language of previous resolutions for similar ceremonial representation of the Government at these historical anniversaries.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Is it not true that Massachusetts has a commission of this kind appointed at every session of Congress, or every year or two, and that other commissions were appointed under Resolutions Nos. 57 and 43 to attend similar celebrations in Massachusetts?

Mr. LUCE. We are now going through the period 150 years after the Revolutionary War. This brought the attendance of representatives of the Government at Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill early in this period. We are now getting nearly through with sesquicentennial celebrations of the Revolutionary War episodes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to consolidate all these activities and not have a new commission go up to Massachusetts at the expense of the Government every term of Congress? Would it not be quite a good deal better just to have one large entertainment or one large centennial in commemoration of all the battles?

Mr. LUCE. The battles in the latter years of the Revolutionary War were chiefly in the South. With the Yorktown celebration we shall have finished for a time the commemorating of Revolutionary episodes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am informed by a Member of the House that a bill has been reported out this morning that appropriates \$10,000 to send a commission of 10 members to Denmark. In view of this fact, does not the gentleman think that \$10,000 is a little bit high just to send a commission from Washington up to Massachusetts and back? Would the gentleman be willing to include an item of \$1,000 to take care of the situation? Then, if there is any deficit, let the patriotic societies in Massachusetts take care of it.

Mr. LUCE. As I have explained, this is an arbitrary maximum that will be required only in case the commission should attend celebrations in various parts of the State. I have, however, no expectation that the amount will be fully used.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In view of the fact that Massachusetts has had a celebration for nearly every battle, unless the gentleman is willing to reduce the amount asked in this bill, I shall have to object.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, if that is the gentleman's pleasure, I shall accept his decision for the time being.

DISTRIBUTION AND PROMOTION OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE LINE OF THE NAVY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1190) to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, if there are three objectors to this bill there is no use wasting the time of the House in talking about this very meritorious bill.

Mr. O'CONNELL. This bill is of such importance that it ought to be considered under a rule. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNELL, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. TABER objected.

CONSTRUCTION OF A GRAVEL ROAD IN THE WALKER RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5057) to provide for the construction of a gravel road in the Walker River Indian Reservation.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. J. Res. 280) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Resolved, etc., That an appropriation not to exceed \$20,000 is hereby authorized, \$10,000 of which shall be for the contribution for 1930 of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group.

SEC. 2. That the American group of the Interparliamentary Union shall submit to the Congress a report, including its expenditures under this appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE PENNSYLVANIA GIFT FOUNTAIN ASSOCIATION TO
ERECT A FOUNTAIN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) to permit the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association to erect a fountain in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, may I have the attention of the erudite gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on the Library? There is under consideration in this bill authorization for the acceptance of a prospective gift of a fountain by the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association. I rise to make an inquiry of the gentleman, who is so well acquainted with the various gift horses that have been heretofore given to the Government, what disposition has been made of the Centennial Fountain that adorned the Botanic Garden, and which was removed to make place for the Meade statue?

I wish to say in that connection that shortly before the death of my lamented friend and leader, the late Hon. James R. Mann, that he was giving consideration to an appropriate site for placing this Centennial Fountain that had been removed from the exposition grounds at Philadelphia shortly after the centennial exhibition. After inquiries of officials, I have not been able to locate the fountain that adorned the Botanic Garden grounds.

Mr. LUCE. The fountain is in storage pending the acquisition of the two squares to which the Botanic Garden is to be moved, and the landscape work in preparation for the new garden, as I recall it, contemplates that this fountain is to be placed in the center of the square to the south. We have been delayed in that regard as in other undertakings here in Washington by the difficulty of acquiring the land at a reasonable price. Within a week the Joint Committee on the Library has taken the final step to secure from the Committee on Appropriations, if possible, the additional appropriation which, it turns out, will be absolutely necessary if the land is to be acquired. In the case of this land, as in the case of all other acquisitions in the neighborhood of the Capitol, the demands of the landowners have been very far in excess of the assessed value of the properties, and such condemnation proceedings as have been carried to a finish have resulted in exposing the Government to the necessity of larger appropriation than it was originally thought might be necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman in his investigation been able to determine whether the assessed value was equal to the real value, or whether it was much below the real value? We have it stated here that much of the property that has been purchased by the Government has been purchased at some four, five, and even ten fold more than the original assessment. A glaring example was the purchase by condemnation of the Congress Hotel and property across from the Capitol. It is hard to believe, for me at least, knowing the character of that building and the ground, that it was worth anywhere near even one-half of the \$700,000 plus paid under condemnation proceedings.

Has the gentleman in his investigation been able to determine whether the assessed value is away below the real value or whether the juries are leveling up the prices three and four fold or more?

Mr. LUCE. I can not answer the question directly, but I may say that in the case of 40 or 50 plots which I think are concerned, although I may have the number too large, the average demand on the part of the owners was as in the case of the property taken for the House Office Building about 130 per cent above the assessed valuation. One owner of land in the proposed site demanded more than 500 per cent of the assessed valuation. Naturally this has compelled condemnation proceedings in nearly all cases. Judging by the findings of the condemnation juries, the assessment has been very much

below the actual value of the property, if we are to assume that the juries are accurate in their findings.

Mr. BRIGGS. What steps are being taken to provide the District of Columbia with a new condemnation law whereby the rights of the Government are better protected than under the existing law?

Mr. LUCE. We passed a new law a year or two ago which it is hoped will prove better than the preceding one, but the gentleman has presented a problem with which the Committee on Appropriations is far more familiar, and I see a member of that committee on his feet. Possibly he can answer the question.

Mr. CRAMTON. In the hearings now in progress on the deficiency appropriation bill in connection with the acquisition of lands in the triangle, the statement presented by the Supervising Architect, Mr. Wetmore, was more reassuring. It was more favorable as to prices that they were obliged to pay either through condemnation or otherwise than has been our experience in the vicinity of the Capitol.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the reason for that because that property has for years been difficult to sell?

Mr. CRAMTON. I would not try to give the testimony, but I think it would be interesting to gentlemen to read it. As I recollect it, there is only one case where the condemnation proceedings have been completed, and there the result, the price fixed by the jury, was fairly satisfactory. I do recall the statement that in the progress so far of acquiring land in the triangle, those lands provided for in the building program, they are getting them within their original estimates as to what the lands would cost them.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has not the development thus far shown the need of additional legislation in the way of an amendment to the present condemnation law so as to further protect the rights of the Government with fairness to the property owners as well?

Mr. CRAMTON. We have recently amended the law, and I have no information as to any further amendment that would be helpful, though I am not saying that there could not be such an amendment.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has there been any condemnation under this amended law so as to contrast it with conditions under the previous condemnation law?

Mr. LUCE. I am not sure. We have just passed through the House two measures to take advantage of the new law, and, of course, these have not had any test. Whether other cases have been completed under the new law I am not informed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Coming to the bill under consideration, what is the significance of this private society wishing to collect more than a million dollars for the purpose of donating a fountain? What is the motivating cause of their wish?

Mr. LUCE. The project seems to have started in the mind of a most excellent woman in Washington, a native of Pennsylvania, who thought it would be a happy thing to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is she related in ideas to the creator of the memorial hall project that lies in a dormant condition on the Mall?

Mr. LUCE. No; I think the circumstances are somewhat different in this case. Persons of high standing in Pennsylvania have taken up the idea.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why? What is the primal motive for wishing to donate a fountain?

Mr. LUCE. The primal motive is patriotic loyalty to the State that has given its name to the Avenue. It seems to me that it would be an excellent thing if other States would follow the same example, and through wish to be honored thereby add more fountains to our streets.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are some fountains on the Avenue to-day that are only partly used. One of them is in a rather obscure place, at least for those using automobiles.

Mr. GREENWOOD. There are none there in keeping with the beauty of the Avenue if this new construction on the Avenue and on the Mall is carried through.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not true with respect to that at Seventh Street and the Avenue.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is necessary to decorate those avenues after the new construction is on. Surely the gentleman does not think we should turn down the great State of Pennsylvania that wishes to decorate the principal avenue of the Capital City.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to honoring the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREENWOOD. They are willing to put up their money for the adornment of the greatest capital city in the world. Should we turn them down?

Mr. STAFFORD. I fear the school children hereafter will be asked to contribute their pennies for this object.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am quite in sympathy with the idea if it is worked out as the picture now is. The report indicates that it is expected to raise a million dollars by the patriotic citizens of Pennsylvania to provide a memorial to go on Pennsylvania Avenue. When we read the bill we find that first the officer in charge of the public parks will be called upon to designate a site. That site doubtless will be in a prominent place. It might possibly be in the area between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets, where there is now a triangle, and where the tentative plan for the improvement of Pennsylvania Avenue contemplates a central square. That officer makes that designation now. If he puts that monument on that square, so long as it has the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, they are within the law.

But there is no requirement that the fountain itself shall be ultimately deemed adequate for the conspicuous site set aside for it, and the language of the report, where a million dollars is mentioned, would not have any binding effect. History has furnished numerous examples where the performance has not been up to the enthusiasm shown at the beginning. Instead of being a million it might be only \$10,000, but the site would have been designated.

Mr. LUCE. I think it was understood by all concerned that the "design" would be worthy of the location. We passed a bill yesterday putting in the control of the Commission of Fine Arts the façades of buildings on the opposite side of the street from public grounds. It is our intention and expectation that we shall be protected in these matters by the judgment and wisdom of the commission.

Mr. CRAMTON. How would this appeal to the gentleman: On page 2, at the end of the first line, insert the words "adequacy for the site designated"?

Mr. LUCE. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then it would read that the design of the fountain and the treatment of the ground and the adequacy of the site selected "would be taken into consideration."

Mr. LUCE. I should be satisfied.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Did your committee investigate and ascertain who was back of this gift fountain association, to determine whether or not it was an association of profiteers, to raise money on the 50-50 basis, or some such plan as other racketeer organizations are pursuing to-day?

Mr. LUCE. I have no information on that subject.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. But what is this association? Who is back of it?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Here is a resolution which simply gives authority to receive a gift. Am I right?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And all sorts of objections are made. A few moments ago we passed bills for marker after marker for which we appropriated money. I do not see the sense of all this, with all due deference.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] approve passing this resolution even under the color of a donation, if some racketeer organization is to go out and raise a million dollars under the racketeer system of 50 per cent going to those who collect the funds?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman from Wisconsin does not attribute any such motive to this resolution?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The possibilities are great, and that is why I am trying to find out if the committee has inquired into those back of this association, to determine whether it is a racketeer association or a bona fide public-spirited citizens' association.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON] had the certificate of incorporation before the committee, and it was taken up with all of us.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is unfortunate that this resolution is being considered to-day when the Pennsylvania primaries are being held.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON], the author of the bill is not here, and in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] that there is no racketeer business behind this resolution, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant permission to the citizens of Pennsylvania, acting through the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association, to erect a fountain, at an appropriate place on part of the public grounds of the United States on Pennsylvania Avenue, in the District of Columbia, as a gift to the people of the United States: *Provided*, That the design of the fountain and the plan for treatment of the grounds connected with its site shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and that it shall be erected under the supervision of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital; that all funds necessary to carry out its erection shall be supplied by the donors in time to permit the completion and erection of the fountain not more than three years after the site is reported available for the purpose; and the United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of said fountain.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOPER: On page 2, line 2, before the word "shall" insert the words "and the adequacy of the site designated."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FOREST ADMINISTRATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10464) to facilitate and simplify national forest administration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] asks unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE EUSTIS HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, my State has a State championship band which is sponsored by several civic organizations, and the band is in the city to-day, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include the names of the boys in that band. It is only a small number.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I take this occasion to briefly call to your attention the educational progress which my State of Florida is making, and in the beginning may I remind you of the financial importance which Dr. C. B. Glenn, superintendent of Birmingham schools, attaches to education. He estimates the monetary value of a high-school diploma at \$56,000. He says that an untrained man with only an elementary education goes to work at 14 years of age, reaches a maximum income at 45, earning on the average less than \$1,700 a year, with a total earning for the period from 14 to 60 years of about \$64,000.

He goes on to state that the high-school graduate begins work at 18 years of age and passes the maximum earning capacity of the elementary trained man in 10 years, rising steadily until he is about 50 years of age. He estimates the amount earned on the average by the high-school man between the years of 18 and 60 at a total of \$88,000, or \$24,000 more than the man with an elementary education only. Thus he believes that each of the four years in high school is worth to the average boy \$6,000.

He further says that the college graduate goes to work at 22 years of age and should earn between the ages of 22 and 60 years approximately \$144,000, thus earning \$56,000 during lifetime more than the average high-school graduate. Hence Doctor Glenn places \$14,000 as the value of each year's college attendance.

The State of Florida has fully realized the importance of elementary, high school, and higher education. In 1905 the present University of Florida and Florida State College for

Women were established. When I entered the University of Florida, almost 20 years ago, its enrollment was well under 200. Now it has an annual enrollment of more than 2,200 young men, together with necessary buildings, classrooms, and other general facilities required by higher institutions of learning. It also has for its president, Dr. John J. Tigert, formerly United States Commissioner of Education, who is properly recognized as one of the ablest university presidents in the world. The Florida State College for Women had a very small enrollment to begin with, but same has rapidly increased until its annual enrollment goes well over fifteen hundred. Its president is Dr. Edward Conradi, whose worthy and efficient administration has retained his services for many years. There are other State institutions, as well as John B. Stetson University at DeLand, Southern College at Lakeland, Rollins College at Winter Park, and a number of other endowed or private institutions.

As feeders to these institutions of higher learning, the State of Florida, together with local and county cooperation, is maintaining in every county one large high school and in many counties there are several such high schools. In fact, the State is spending some \$50,000,000 annually for elementary and high-school education with the remarkable result of some 5,000 high-school graduates annually.

The educational and intellectual is not the only side of life which is dealt with in the Florida public-school system, but the musical and aesthetic as well. In fact many of the high schools have splendid musical organizations carried on under competent and thorough instruction and this brings me to the real subject of my discourse.

Recently the State of Florida held a contest for the State high-school band championship, and as the winner of this contest the Eustis High School Boys' Band ended in first place. Eustis, in Lake County, Fla., recently obtained national fame by winning the National Girl's 4-H Club health contest. Miss Florence Smock, of Eustis, brought this national championship honor to Florida. Now the Eustis High School Boys' Band has won the State championship and has been given a trip to the Capital and to Flint, Mich., by the Eustis Rotary Club, the Eustis Kiwanis Club, the Elks Club, and other organizations of Eustis and Lake County. The personnel of the band is kept up to approximately 50 boys, ranging in age from 11 to 18 years, or an average of 14½ years.

The present organization represents 15 States of the United States in that the boys composing the band were born in as many States but removed to Florida with their parents to reside. They came from as far west as New Mexico and as far north as Maine.

Their names and ages are: J. R. Ashmore, jr., 17; James Greyden, 14; George Cochrane, jr., 16; Jack Nepp, 15; Jim Mulholland, 14; Elwin Moore, 14; Bill Quayle, 12; Junior MacDonald, 13; Irving Foigin, 12; Robert Brown, 15; Bryon Dean, 12; William Hannum, 14; Emory Owens, 13; Norman Herrick, 15; Paul Baker, 14; Phillip Earnest, 13; Harry Foigin, 17; Tom Hannah, 17; Kenneth Glass, 16; Stanley Tyre, 11; Joe Burkhalter, 18; George Baugher, 18; Jim Kinsor, 17; Hubert Miller, 18; William Adams, 14; Harry Hannah, jr., 16; Richard Jones, 14; Lawrence Taylor, 13; Earnest Pike, 18; Harry Thomas, 13; William Ham, 12; Bobbie Jackson, 12; Gene Isted, 11; Morton Hopson, 17; Dick Lum, 14; Murray Thomas, 15; Raymond Combs, 18; Carl Story, 15; Donald Haselton, 16; Neal Maston, 16; Jimmie Hunter, 16; Ernest Moore, 15; William Cathrae, 12; Harold Gore, 15; Dwight Bray, 14.

Every class in the junior and senior high school is represented in the band. There is a total enrollment of 213 in the two schools. Music is a part of the course of study.

They have given programs at Rotary district convention, Atlanta, Ga.; Washington and Lee-University of Florida football game, Jacksonville, Fla.; concert in Hemming Park, Jacksonville Shrine Club; inauguration of Gov. Doyle E. Carlton at Tallahassee, Fla.; South Florida Fair, Tampa, Fla.; reception to ex-President and Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, Mount Dora, Fla.; Volusia County Fair, De Land; Central Florida Exposition, Orlando; Elks' parade and institution of Eustis Lodge of Elks; reception to Southern Commercial Secretaries; broadcast from radio station WDBO, Orlando, and State radio station WRUF, Gainesville; and number of local events.

The members of this band have spent to-day in the city of Washington and recently sat in the House gallery. Of course, many of my colleagues had the privilege of seeing them. They have been greatly inspired by this trip to the Nation's Capital and are going on from here to Flint, Mich.

The band is supported by taxation from Lake County School Board and publicity fund of the city of Eustis to the Eustis Chamber of Commerce. Liberal support is accorded by all

organizations. The present trip to Washington and to Flint, Mich., is made possible by the generosity of the citizens of Florida and throughout the country.

No member of the band receives any compensation whatever for band services. The band plays an average of two concerts a week during the winter season.

On this trip, besides the members of the band, are Capt. James B. O'Neal, leader since organization, and Mrs. O'Neal; Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Jackson. Mr. Jackson is business manager and financial agent. Mrs. Jackson is a graduate trained nurse.

These young men represent that high type of citizenship training which is now being offered in Florida's splendid public-school system. I have great pride in these young men and so has the State of Florida. Their future usefulness as citizens to my State and to the Nation will be greatly enriched by their splendid experience to-day here in our Nation's Capital. [Applause.]

ALASKA GAME LAW

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11285) to amend the Alaska game law.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in looking over the report I thought the fee charged to non-resident corporations was extremely high, being \$500, and that it might result in some reciprocal policy by Canada, which would be the only country affected in case this amendment is adopted. I refer to the section on page 7—

If the applicant is an alien, or is a corporation, association, or copartnership, not organized under the laws of the Territory or of a State of the United States, or is a corporation, association, or copartnership, any stockholder or member of which is an alien, \$500.

I notice in reading this that it covers not only a corporation but an individual. There should be some comity existing between our country and Canada, notwithstanding the tariff barriers that are being attempted to be raised under the existing tariff law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is a point that is very often raised, but, nevertheless, this has been in effect for the past six years, and it would seem to be a discrimination against aliens but it is not.

Mr. STAFFORD. This does not apply to the Japanese and Chinese directly, but to the Canadians, I suppose.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It applies to all aliens.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Canadians have sporting instincts and have occasion to go across the Alaskan boundary. Why should they be penalized to the extent of \$500 for a license fee?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know that the reason is any less for a Canadian than a Chinaman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I can appreciate, with the feeling on the Pacific coast, that you might be more inclined to penalize a Japanese or Chinese.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But an alien is an alien. This does not discriminate against any race. We have a great many Scandinavians who have been living there for 20 years who have never taken out citizenship papers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean that they are obliged to pay a license fee of \$500 because they are not naturalized citizens, although residents of Alaska?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; they have done so in the past.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If the gentleman will yield; this does not change the law.

Mr. GREENWOOD. This does not raise any of the license fees or charges?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It reduces them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Even though it is existing law, and it is attempted to reenact the law, it seems to me it is an outrageous amount.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL RADIO STATION, SEAWALL, ME.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 428) to authorize the transfer of the former naval radio station, Seawall, Me., as an addition to the Acadia National Park.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if this property to be transferred is adjacent to the Acadia National Park?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. They are picking up different parcels of land from year to year and combining them into one beautiful park.

Mr. COLLINS. And they will finally be connected?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. I think there is no doubt of it, and they need this land.

Mr. COLLINS. How far is this land from the national park? Mr. NELSON of Maine. I am not sure, but some of it adjoins the park lands; at least, it is very near it.

Mr. COLLINS. Is the gentleman certain that some of it adjoins the park?

Mr. NELSON of Maine. I could not state that positively, but I know it is all very near it.

Mr. DYER. It is near enough.

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Not only that, but they are picking up land all the time and putting it together. It is land that no other department of the Government wants to use, and it simply means transferring it from the Navy Department to the Interior Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as an addition to the Acadia National Park, established under the act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1178), as amended by the act of January 19, 1929 (Public, No. 667, 70th Cong.), all that tract of land containing 223 acres, more or less, with improvements thereon, comprising the former naval radio station at Seawall, town of Southwest Harbor, Hancock County, Me., said tract being no longer needed for naval purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF MATERIAL NO LONGER NEEDED BY THE NAVY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3185) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to find out why the Navy wants the schools, colleges, and universities of the country to use obsolete machinery and equipment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that oftentimes the Secretary of the Navy receives a request from some school for a certain kind of tools to carry on vocational training. Under the law the Secretary is precluded from complying with the request, and if any school desires these tools and they are obsolete as far as the Navy is concerned it is desired that the Navy be permitted to transfer them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The law also provides for the furnishing of motors to these schools, so they can be taken apart and used in connection with their mechanical training.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. In other words, you are going to transfer worth-while equipment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say it would not be an economical proposition for the Navy to transfer material that can be used and is needed by the Navy, but when the Navy has some machinery that is of no particular use to the Navy, instead of letting it go into the scrap heap and be scrapped it would be a good thing to transfer it to some school for the purpose of using it in instructing the pupils.

Mr. COLLINS. I did not want obsolete equipment to be transferred. If it is useless, it should be destroyed. To transfer it may help the Navy Department from a bookkeeping standpoint, but no good would come from it, and Congress should not sanction a transfer merely for this purpose. A careful check up should later be made of the transferred articles to find out if they are good or bad, so that the Congress can discontinue the practice if the articles are useless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to dispose of, without charge, except

for transportation and delivery, to properly accredited schools, colleges, and universities, for use in courses of vocational training and instruction, such machinery, mechanical equipment, and tools as may be obsolete or no longer needed by the Navy.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE, STATE OF MICHIGAN

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3934) granting certain lands to the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman from Michigan who reported the bill will have no objection to striking out the preamble.

Mr. HOOPER. I have prepared an amendment to that effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the land donated to school district No. 1, Sault Ste. Marie Township, Chippewa County, Mich., under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 519), is not being used for the purpose for which granted: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the land donated to school district No. 1, Sault Ste. Marie Township, Chippewa County, Mich., under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1875, be, and it is hereby, forfeited to the United States, and the United States hereby resumes the title thereto.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue patent in fee to the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan, for the land donated to school district No. 1, Sault Ste. Marie Township, Chippewa County, Mich., under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to donate a certain portion of the military reservation at Fort Brady to school district No. 1, in township of Sault Ste. Marie, and State of Michigan, for school purposes," approved March 3, 1875, and to make whatever supplemental survey is necessary to secure the definite location, identification, and description of the tract to be conveyed.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I just wish to say that this bill is in a form, perhaps, which is a trifle out of the ordinary. A question was raised in the committee as to whether the property could be forfeited in just this particular way, as described in the first paragraph of the bill. Doctor BOHN, the author of the bill and the Member of Congress from the district in which Sault Ste. Marie is located, has secured, at the request of our committee, from the school board which is affected by this the promise that they will at once give a quitclaim deed which will cover any possible defect.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOPER: Page 1, after the title, strike out the preamble, beginning with the word "Whereas," to and including the word "Therefore."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FOREST ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 460 on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 460. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This is a bill to which I objected, but I have since obtained the information I desired.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman, after further investigation, believes the bill should be passed?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed there is a similar Senate bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider Senate bill 3817 in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend not to exceed \$8,000 annually, out of any money appropriated for the improvement or protection of the national forests, for the fiscal year 1930 or for subsequent years, in the completion of water supply or sanitary systems costing in excess of the \$500 limitation as imposed by the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1132).

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse owners of private property for damage or destruction thereof caused by employees of the United States in connection with the protection, administration, or improvement of the national forests, payment to be made from any funds appropriated for the protection, administration, and improvement of the national forests: *Provided*, That no payment in excess of \$500 shall be made on any such claim.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in cases of emergency to incur such expenses as may be necessary in searching for persons lost in the national forests and in transporting persons seriously ill, injured, or who die within the national forests to the nearest place where the sick or injured person, or the body, may be transferred to interested parties or local authorities.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Before the objection stage was passed I intended to inquire as to whether, in the administration of the Forest Service, there is any practice by which the Government is reimbursed for the expenses of transporting the remains of persons who die in the national forests.

Mr. LEAVITT. There is no such practice. The responsibility of the Government grows largely out of the fact that the national forests have become great recreational areas and are visited by a tremendous number of citizens of this country each year.

Sickness and accident take place and the responsibility falls on the forest ranger or the existing forest officer. He sometimes has to hire saddle horses, pack horses, or wagons, or help to take out an injured person, and naturally the local people look to him for reimbursement. This is one of the responsibilities the Government has to meet in the protection of its own people.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the provisions of section 3 I believe the Government could even provide for the expenses of transportation of the remains of a person who died in a forest to his home.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; it states to the nearest point where the sick or injured person or the body may be transferred, to interested parties or local authorities. In actual practice this would take the injured person out to a community where there was a doctor or a hospital and the dead person out to a place where there was a coroner or to a railroad station, where the responsibility of others would take charge.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was going to suggest an amendment, although I do not believe I shall insist upon it, at the end of section 3 to add, "and to receive reimbursement for such expenses from such persons, their relatives, or estates."

Mr. LEAVITT. I doubt if such an amendment as that should be made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not press the amendment and I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

MONEY ORDERS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8568) to compensate the Post Office Department for the extra work caused by the payment of money orders at offices other than those on which the orders are drawn.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice it is provided in this bill that a fee is to be charged for cashing a money order at any other office except the one on which it is drawn and the fee is to be equal to the amount charged originally for the issuance of the money order.

Mr. FOSS. The same fee that you pay when you get the money order.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It strikes me this would be excessive in some instances, and I think the additional fee ought to be limited in amount to a 10-cent charge for cashing a money order under such circumstances.

Mr. FOSS. The object of the bill is that when an order is paid at any other office except the one on which it is drawn the postmaster has to notify the office on which it is drawn, and also notify the office which draws the order, and then has to get a receipt or a check back from the original office before he can get credit on his books for the amount of the order. This requires practically twice as much work.

Mr. GREENWOOD. A portion of that same detail is necessary in cashing the order at the office on which it is drawn. Some of these reports have to be made in any event, and inasmuch as the department is being relieved of that detail in the office on which it is drawn, it would seem to me the additional fee to be charged ought to be limited to 10 cents. I am not against the purpose of the bill, but I think to allow a fee equal to the original charge would perhaps be excessive.

Mr. FOSS. The amount of the fee, of course, depends on the size of the money order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit—I am not going to object to this bill, because I have objected to so many bills coming from the Post Office Department—but it would seem to me that the Post Office Department is devising every possible means to drive business away from them. Imagine a man getting a draft on a bank and then, because he wants to collect at another branch of the same bank, having to pay an extra fee. A bank would not charge him another fee for that service. The department seems to hit upon all sorts of schemes for getting new receipts, extra receipts, for instance, with respect to directory service; and now, because a man gets a money order payable at Newark, N. J., and wants to cash it in Jersey City, he is going to be charged a new fee. I do not know what is getting into the heads of the present Post Office administration, but they are certainly going out of their way thinking up new fees that may be charged.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think that all these bills from the Committee on the Post Office that propose to raise fees in the Postal Service should come up on a calendar day for discussion and amendment, so that the House would fully understand all the details.

I think to charge the same fee as was originally charged in obtaining the money order is excessive, but if the gentleman will accept an amendment limiting it to 10 cents, then, if a customer feels that he would rather go to another office, as a matter of convenience, and pay the 10 cents, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall not object to the bill; otherwise I will object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FOSS. Of course, this privilege is being abused now by people sending money orders they receive through the mails and using them as checks. So far as I am concerned, I would not object to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I have such an amendment prepared.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman's amendment would provide for a fee not exceeding 10 cents?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes; when the money order is cashed at an office different from the one on which it is drawn.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think the gentleman is quite right.

Mr. FOSS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Who is the author of the idea expressed in this bill?

Mr. FOSS. This is a recommendation of the department.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Who is to pay this extra charge?

Mr. FOSS. The payee.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. The payee then has to pay to get his check or order cashed and the sender of the order had to pay for it in the first instance?

Mr. FOSS. Of course, it would not be the original payee. It would be indorsed over to some one else, unless the payee carried it around in his pocket and used it in place of an express check; and that is being done.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. But when it is cashed at the post office the one who cashes the order must pay this fee?

Mr. FOSS. He would pay the 10 cents extra for that convenience.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. And the purchaser has paid a fee for it in the first instance?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I object.

HIRE OF VEHICLES FROM VILLAGE-DELIVERY CARRIERS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9300) to authorize the Postmaster General to hire vehicles from village-delivery carriers.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 20, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hire vehicles from letter carriers for use in service" (45 Stat. 1252; U. S. C., Sup. III, title 39, sec. 52) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That beginning with the fiscal year 1928, and thereafter, the Postmaster General may hire vehicles from letter carriers for use in the city delivery and collection service, and in the village delivery and collection service, either under an allowance or on a contract basis."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time. was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTENDANCE OF THE MARINE BAND AT THE NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC AT CINCINNATI, OHIO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10082) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, during the week beginning August 24, 1930.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such reunion there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 10, strike out the numerals "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,532.26."

Line 12, after the word "act," strike out period, insert a colon, and add the following proviso: "*Provided*, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Marine Band be allowed not to exceed \$5 per day each for actual living expenses while on this duty, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which they would be entitled while serving at their permanent station."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI NATIONAL PARK IN THE STATE OF IOWA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4020) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the advisability and practicability of establishing a national park to be known as the Upper Mississippi National Park in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I do not know that I will object to anything outside of the appropriation, but I want to make this observation: Gentlemen do not seem to understand the situation with reference to such propositions as this. In the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending 1931 there is carried for the first time a specific appropriation to enable the National Park Service to do just what this bill authorizes to be done. That being true, it is not necessary to pass a law to instruct or authorize them to do it. All that it is necessary to do is to go to the National Park Service and make a request, and I know that a request coming from the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] would be complied with as rapidly as this type of work would permit. They would do it. This bill is entirely unnecessary. I will have to object to that part of it that makes a special appropriation. As to the other part, it is wasted effort, but it can be done.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Does the gentleman think that an investigation can be made in three or four States for \$500?

Mr. CRAMTON. That may be true, but the item in the Interior appropriation bill not only gives an appropriation which can be supplemented but it gives authority to employ experts to make a thorough investigation, an investigation worth while.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; if they are located on the ground they can.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I think you will run up against this situation: Where a certain appropriation is specifically named for a specific purpose no general appropriation can be used for the same purpose. I think it will be better for the gentleman to have lines 12 to 15 stricken out.

Mr. COLTON. Does the gentleman understand that the Park Service has funds with which they can go to the various parts of the United States and make investigation without authorization by Congress?

Mr. CRAMTON. Absolutely; as I say that is an item in the Interior Department bill that has not been in heretofore.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The report contains a letter from the Acting Director of the National Park Service saying that funds are provided for this purpose in the fiscal year 1931 in the appropriation bill and that this authorization is unnecessary. I do not think this kind of a bill, where that is shown by the Acting Director, ought to be reported to Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there would be this danger. If you pass this bill as reported, you would be limited to this appropriation, and I am not sure that the department would have the general authority they have otherwise to employ experts other than their own staff. As the gentleman knows, their own staff is sometimes pretty well occupied, and could not make the examination.

Mr. COLTON. Is there authority of law for the appropriation the gentleman has referred to?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly. The National Park Service act is very broad.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The committee has an amendment including certain counties in Minnesota along the Mississippi River.

Mr. COLTON. That amendment was made at the suggestion of the Interior Department.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment which I propose, adding two adjoining counties to go into the general program?

Mr. COLTON. I would have no objection.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Then I shall not object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. It will be agreeable to eliminate lines 12 to 15, will it, carrying the special appropriation?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to investigate and report to Congress as to the desirability and practicability of establishing a national park, to be known as the Upper Mississippi National Park, along the Mississippi River in the counties of Jackson, Dubuque, Clayton, and Allamakee of the State of Iowa and vicinity for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States and to preserve said area in its natural state, including in his report full information as to the ownership, value, estimated cost to acquire, and character of the lands involved and his opinion as to whether such areas measure up to national-park standards. And there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for expenses of such investigation.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Iowa," insert a semicolon and the words "the county of Jo Daviess of the State of Illinois; the counties of Grant, Crawford, Vernon, La Crosse, Trempealeau, Buffalo, Pepin, and Pierce of the State of Wisconsin; and the counties of Houston, Winona, Wabasha, and Goodhue of the State of Minnesota."

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDRESEN: Page 2, line 5, after the word "Wabasha," strike out the word "and," insert a comma after the word "Goodhue," and add the following: "Dakota and Washington."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 11, "standards," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the advisability and practicability of establishing a national park to be known as the Upper Mississippi National Park in the States of Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota."

TUSAYAN NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3585) to eliminate certain land from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., as an addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this transfer is what would be about five civil townships of land from the national forests to the Indian reservation.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is the gentleman familiar with the character of land; does he know whether there is any timber on the land?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. This land has on it some timber, but it would be classified as woodland rather than as having any great present forest value. It is on the edge of a national forest and is shut out from the national forest by the canyon of the Colorado in such a way that it is not accessible to the remainder of the forest for administrative purposes. On the other hand, it adjoins the Indian reservation, and the Indians use it, graze stock on it, and this is merely to transfer from the forest to the Indian reservation.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is just to consolidate and straighten up the lines of the two different tracts?

Mr. LEAVITT. To get a natural boundary for administrative purposes, and it allows the exchange of any private lands which may be in this area that goes from the national forest, for other public lands within the same State, outside of that area.

Mr. COLTON. And it is valuable only for grazing purposes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It is not valuable as timber?

Mr. COLTON. No.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Is this transfer without consideration to the Indians, just a gift to them?

Mr. LEAVITT. It is an area that has been used from time immemorial by the Indians. In the running of the boundary line of the national forest the existing reservation line was taken as a national forest line. As a practical matter, the natural boundary line is the deep canyon of the Colorado and the Little Colorado.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Does the bill provide for a transfer of the mineral and oil rights on the land to the Indians?

Mr. COLTON. The land is now in the national forest.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Nevertheless, whatever mineral is in the land now, the title to it is in the Government.

Mr. LEAVITT. This goes to the Indians; there is no reservation made.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. How much of it is there?

Mr. LEAVITT. Eighty-two thousand six hundred and twenty acres.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. This is just a donation of Government land?

Mr. LEAVITT. It is a donation to the Indians of land that they have been using from time immemorial.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. But even so, the white man pastures over the same lands?

Mr. LEAVITT. Oh, no. There are some private holdings, not of an extensive character, within the area, and the bill provides that those people may make selection of other public lands outside the area, and that an exchange may be made. That is to the advantage of these people, because as the situation now is the Indians graze in there and use the land. Some of them live on this land, and these settlers can not be protected.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. How near is this land to oil development?

Mr. LEAVITT. A considerable distance.

Mr. GREENWOOD. What is the situation with those settlers if they do not prefer to make the exchange?

Mr. LEAVITT. I understand that it is known to the department that they do wish to make the exchange.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will there be the proper reservation made to protect anyone there if he does not want to make the exchange?

Mr. LEAVITT. Oh, yes. They are not required to make any such exchange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described land be, and the same is hereby, eliminated from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., and added to and made a part of the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, subject to all valid rights and claims of individuals initiated prior to the approval of this act: All that part of the Tusayan National Forest lying east of the Colorado River and north of the Little Colorado River, unsurveyed, but which will probably be when surveyed in townships 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36 north, ranges 5 and 6 east; all lands in township 31 north, range 6 east, which are now a part of the Tusayan National Forest; sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 to 14, inclusive, east half section 23, sections 24 and 25, east half section 26, and sections 35 and 36, township 30 north, range 6 east; sections 27 to 34, inclusive, township 30 north, range 7 east; sections 1, 2, and 11 to 14, inclusive, sections 23 to 26, inclusive, sections 35 and 36, township 29 north, range 6 east; sections 3 to 10, inclusive, and sections 15 to 36, inclusive, township 29 north, range 7 east; section 1 and north half section 12, township 28 north, range 6 east; sections 1 to 23, inclusive, and sections 29 to 32, inclusive, township 28 north, range 7 east; Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona: *Provided*, That all unappropriated and unreserved public lands in sections 24 to 28, inclusive, and sections 33 to 36, inclusive, in township 28 north, range 7 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona, be, and the same are hereby, added to and made a part of the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, subject to all valid rights and claims of individuals initiated prior to approval of this act.

SEC. 2. That upon conveyance to the United States of a good and sufficient title to any privately owned land within the areas described in this act, the owners or their assigns thereof are hereby authorized under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior to select at any time within 15 years after the approval of this act, from the surveyed, unappropriated, unreserved, nonmineral public lands of the United States, in the State of Arizona, land approximately equal in value to the lands thus conveyed, such values to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue patents for the lands thus selected: *Provided*, That the lands conveyed to the United States under authority of this act shall thereupon become a part of the Western Navajo Indian Reservation.

SEC. 3. That before any exchange of lands as above provided is effected, notice of such exchange describing the lands involved therein shall be published once each week for four consecutive weeks in some newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties within which the selected lands are situated.

SEC. 4. That the State of Arizona shall have the right to select other public lands in lieu of sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 within said addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, in the same manner as is provided in the enabling act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 557).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, TO ISSUE BONDS

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 412, to the bill (H. R. 9707) to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring public-utility properties, and for other purposes.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I am imposing somewhat on the patience of the House in asking to return to a bill passed over yesterday at the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. It is a bill, however, of great importance to a community of my district, and if it is not passed at this session of Congress it would have no effect.

It provides that the city of Ketchikan can issue bonds not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the public-utility properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co. The time limit expires in September of this year. Hence my anxiety to have the bill passed at this session. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will consent, I shall appreciate his action.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9707) to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring public-utility properties, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I did not have the report at hand when I examined the bill the day before. I asked unanimous consent to have the bill passed over without prejudice in order that I might examine the report.

I have read the report since and the bill carefully, and I question the advisability of authorizing a small community in Alaska to go into the ownership and operation of an electric-light plant, especially as the report shows that the bonded indebtedness of the municipality is now \$150,000, upon which payments of \$10,000 per annum have been made in the past four years.

I am a firm believer in the policy of local self-government, and I would not interpose my objection to having a municipality acquire this lighting plant; but I question very much the advisability of it. I fear that some day the local people there will regret their bonding themselves to the enormous amount of a million dollars for the purchase of a plant which is now in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. While it is true that the company is in the hands of a receiver, yet it is a mother company, and this plant is operating at a profit. I think they make a profit of \$145,000 every year. This plant otherwise would be sold to satisfy the demands of creditors. This particular plant is a profit-making concern, and certainly it would be to the advantage of the community to buy it itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose the gentleman contends that although there is already a bonded indebtedness of \$150,000 on the municipality, presumably for school purposes, they are going to bond their city for a million dollars so that they can not bond themselves further for needed school purposes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The property will be back of the bonds.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is true; but there is no necessity of acquiring the utility and perhaps blocking the issuance of additional bonds for necessary improvements.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The people up there ought to know what they want.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Territory is very ably represented.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Yes; the people there are very well represented. They ought to know what is best for themselves.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to issue its bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring for the said town of Ketchikan the public-utility properties of the Citizens Light, Power & Water Co. and to finance and operate the same by the municipality of Ketchikan: *Provided, however,* That no issue of bonds or other instruments of any such indebtedness shall be made, other than such bonds or other instruments of indebtedness in serial form maturing in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than five years from the date of the issue of such series and the last installment not later than 50 years from the date of such issue.

SEC. 2. That before said bonds shall be issued a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the town of Ketchikan, at which election the question of whether such bonds shall be issued shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the said town of Ketchikan whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said town for municipal taxation. Thirty days' notice of such election shall be given by publication thereof in a newspaper printed and published and of general circulation in said town before the day fixed for such election.

SEC. 3. That the registration of such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of said election shall be, as near as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law in general or special elections in said municipality, and said bonds shall be issued only upon condition that a majority of the votes cast at such election in said town shall be in favor of issuing said bonds.

SEC. 4. That the bonds above specified, when authorized to be issued as hereinbefore provided, shall bear interest, at a rate to be fixed by the common council of Ketchikan, not to exceed 6 per cent per annum, payable semiannually and shall not be sold for less than their par value, with accrued interest, and shall be in denominations not exceeding \$1,000 each, the principal to be due in 50 years from date thereof: *Provided, however,* That the common council of the said town of Ketchikan may reserve the right to pay off such bonds in their numerical order, at the rate of not less than \$22,000 thereof per annum from and after the expiration of five years from their date. Principal and interest shall be payable in lawful money of the United States of America at the office of the town treasurer or such place as may be designated by the common council of the town of Ketchikan, the place of payment to be mentioned in the bonds: *And provided further,* That each and every such bond shall have the written signature of the mayor and clerk of said town of Ketchikan and also bear the seal of said town.

SEC. 5. That no part of the funds arising from the sale of said bonds shall be used for any purpose other than that specified in this act. Said bonds shall be sold only in such amounts as the common council shall direct, and the proceeds thereof shall be disbursed for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned and under the order and direction of said common council from time to time as the same may be required for said purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ARMY AND NAVY HOSPITAL, HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill H. R. 6124, No. 481 on the Consent Calendar, which we are now working on. I will state to the House that that is an emergency matter. I wish to ask unanimous consent to read a copy of a letter showing that there is an emergency.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6124) to provide for the reconstruction of the Army and Navy hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I doubt if the Government has ever owned and operated any institution for the good of mankind that has accomplished as much good to humanity as the general hospital for the Army, Navy, and veterans at Hot Springs National Park, Ark.

The corner stone for this hospital was laid in the year 1883 and was built under an act of Congress in June, 1882, and one of the main objectives when it was built was to take care of the old Civil War veterans. The Army and Navy have since that time used the hospital for the care of officers and enlisted men on the active and retired lists of both services including the Marine Corps and United States Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey. It served the purpose well at that time.

Now, modern medicine has made tremendous strides in the last 50 years and so much so that none of the modern facilities now required were provided when this hospital was built. Necessity for modern equipment and facilities has become evident to meet the urgent demands and especially so since the World War.

The past managers of this hospital are certainly to be commended for the splendid work that they have done with the equipment with which they have had to work. Every available space has been converted to use in this building, and they could use double the space that is being used now. The eye, ear, nose, and throat clinic is operated in the basement. They are now utilizing what was formerly the guardhouse, the post office, and hospital library. The present Red Cross office and library are now kept in what was formerly the medical supply office and a part of the storeroom of the hospital. The hospital originally did not have a single operating room.

They now have practically every modern facility and are well equipped, but the equipment and facilities are not so arranged to be convenient for the patients and makes the hospital difficult to administer.

The normal bed capacity for this hospital is 169, but by using the porches and passages and other locations not originally intended for the purpose, they can crowd in 300 patients in this hospital. They frequently have as high as 275 patients at one time there, and, of course, they are constantly coming and going as they are treated.

I think it is the consensus of opinion of the medical world that the waters of Hot Springs are as fine as can be found in the world and are very beneficial in treating many diseases, and the result has been the saving of the lives of many men.

I know of many persons that have come under my own observation that have been brought to this great resort on stretchers and in so much pain that they could hardly be moved and within a very short time would be restored to their normal health.

There are many diseases that can be treated successfully there that have never been treated successfully elsewhere, by the aid and use of the waters of this great wonder of nature.

This building is now 47 years old and inadequate and out of date. The walls were built of brick, but the entire framework is all of wood, and the floors, beams, joists, and rafters are all of wood. The building is not fireproof but is in fact a fire trap. Its porches and stairways are all of wood.

To care for the 300 patients that they are constantly caring for they have to crowd beds and cots in the passageways and on the side porches. The regional office of the United States Veterans' Bureau at Little Rock, Ark., serves as a kind of clearing house for all applicants for hospitalization at Hot Springs, and there is constantly on the waiting list awaiting admission from 65 to 150 persons. Many of the soldiers in the

last war are suffering with rheumatism, either from traumatic or other causes of the last war, and are cured by the healing waters of Hot Springs as well as many other of the diseases they are suffering from.

This is to be a general hospital for the Army, Navy, and veterans. It is shown by the testimony that 70 per cent of the patient load are now, and have been since the war, veterans of the World War, and that 30 per cent are Army and Navy patients. The bill we passed and which was approved December, 1929, provided for an appropriation of \$1,050,000 from the veterans' fund, and this bill authorizes an appropriation of \$450,000, making the required amount of \$1,500,000, which it is estimated will complete a fireproof, modern hospital of 410 beds.

There are a number of men in this Congress that have either been treated in or visited this great hospital who know the needs of this rebuilding, and I do not believe that there will be a vote in this Congress against this bill.

It is the plan to erect the new building by sections, so that the hospital can continue its operations constantly while the buildings are being erected. The site is one of the most beautiful and commanding sites for a hospital that is to-day owned by the Government, and when this building is erected it will stand as a monument for ages to the good judgment of this Congress in providing for its construction.

It is exceedingly fortunate that this building has not been destroyed by fire long before this time, and it has only been prevented by Providence and the splendid good management and care taken by those operating it. We read in the paper a few weeks ago of more than 300 persons in Ohio that perished in the flames. It would be a horrible thing for these splendid men in this hospital, many of whom would be incapable of extricating themselves in case of fire, to lose their lives in a building of this character after they have made the great sacrifice that they have made for this great Government. Let us provide for the construction of this fireproof building and give them the protection that they so richly deserve by the great service they have performed.

Mr. HOOPER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and personally I have no wish to object—I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER] if he will not withhold now and call this bill up a little later? My colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who is very active with respect to this calendar, asked me to submit a unanimous-consent request that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I have no interest in it myself. If the gentleman from Arkansas will withhold for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan will be here. I will send for him at once.

Mr. GLOVER. Very well.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE PEE DEE AND WACCAMAW RIVERS, S. C.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 4182, No. 537 on the Consent Calendar, be taken up out of its order. It is an emergency matter.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4182) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Georgetown, S. C., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand that this is an emergency matter?

Mr. GASQUE. It is an emergency matter.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This bill provides for a toll bridge owned and operated by a municipality?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes; by the county of Georgetown, S. C.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman give us assurance that an amendment will not be offered to make this a private toll bridge after the unanimous-consent objection stage has passed?

Mr. GASQUE. I can assure the gentleman that I will not be a party to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the county of Georgetown, S. C., or its board of county commissioners, their successors or assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pee Dee River and a bridge and approaches thereto across the Waccamaw River at points suitable to the interests of navigation, both at or near the city of Georgetown, S. C., in accordance with the provisions of the

act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in said act.

SEC. 2. The said county of Georgetown or its board of county commissioners, their successors and assigns, are authorized to construct, maintain, and operate such bridges and the necessary approaches thereto as highway bridges for the passage of pedestrians, animals, and vehicles adapted to travel on public highways.

SEC. 3. The said county of Georgetown, or its county commissioners or the successors thereof, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridges, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridges the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridges and their approaches under economical management, to pay an adequate return on the cost thereof, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridges and their approaches, including reasonable interest and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges but within a period of not to exceed 25 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridges and their approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the cost of the bridges and their approaches, expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the county of Georgetown, S. C., or its board of county commissioners, their successors and assigns; and any corporation to which, or any person to whom, such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure, or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of County Commissioners of Georgetown County, State of South Carolina, and their successors in office, to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Pee Dee River and a highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Waccamaw River, at points suitable to the interests of navigation, both at or near the city of Georgetown, S. C., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

"SEC. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridges, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridges and their approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridges and their approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, in accordance with the laws of the State of South Carolina applicable thereto, but within a period of not to exceed 25 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the costs of the bridges and their approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

"SEC. 3. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Board of County Commissioners of Georgetown County, and their successors in office, for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina authorizing the construction of the bridges authorized by this act. And any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to authorize the same as though fully authorized upon such corporation or person.

"SEC. 4. During the construction or after the completion of the bridges authorized by this act the State of South Carolina or the highway department thereof may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridges and their approaches, and any interest in real estate necessary therefor, by purchase or by con-

demnition, in accordance with the laws of the State of South Carolina governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation.

"Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESS OF MILITARY MEDICINE AND PHARMACY

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Union Calendar No. 210, House Joint Resolution 253, providing appropriation for the International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KORELL] asks unanimous consent to return to Union Calendar 210.

The Clerk will report the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KORELL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum, not exceeding \$10,000, as may by the President be considered necessary for the expenses of participation by the United States through delegates appointed by the President in the Sixth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Budapest, including travel expenses, subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), compensation of employees, stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary (without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes), purchase of necessary books and documents, printing and binding in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, official cards, and such other expenses as the President may deem necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST, ARK.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10780) to transfer certain lands to the Ouachita National Forest, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 24, township 4 north, range 28 west, fifth principal meridian, be, and the same is hereby, transferred to and made a part of the Ouachita National Forest, in the State of Arkansas, and shall hereafter be administered subject to the laws and regulations relating to the national forest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE FROM WABASHA, MINN., TO NELSON, WIS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10823) to grant a right of way or easement over lands of the United States within the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge to the Wabasha-Nelson Bridge Co., assignee of the Wabasha Bridge Committee, for the construction of a bridge from Wabasha, Minn., to Nelson, Wis., as authorized by the act of March 10, 1928, as amended December 13, 1929.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I will withhold the objection.

Mr. ANDRESEN. This bill is an emergency.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I know it is.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] give some reason for objecting?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; this is a toll bridge.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Certainly. Authorized by an act passed by Congress.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Owned and operated for profit. Now you are seeking to give them a right of way over Government property as an approach to this bridge?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. How are you going to get across the river when the wild life and game refuge goes alongside of the river?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why did they put the bridge there?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. The river has been crossed at that point by ferry for years. There is already a road through there, but it is not straight. It is too narrow and it is located where it will be flooded at high water.

Mr. ANDRESEN. This provision should have been in the original act as it was passed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think there is a defect in the bill which the gentleman has not realized. I do not object to the bill, but I do not think even the Secretary of Agriculture should be authorized to permit a right of way to be used for any other purpose than the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I have no objection to limiting it to that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Next, lines 6 and 7, on page 3, provide that on reversion it becomes a part of the said upper Mississippi River wild life and fish refuge. As a matter of fact, I do not believe it ever ceases to be a part of that refuge, and hence that language ought not to be there. We will simply give an easement over a highway in the refuge, but it does not cease to be a part of the refuge.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The fee title will remain in the Government and all that reverts is the easement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I thought it meant the whole thing.

Mr. ANDRESEN. No.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, I have been told that the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin contemplate taking over this bridge and making it a free bridge. If that is so and you retain section 2 in the bill, this private toll-bridge monopoly will have the right to take the right of way we are going to give them under this bill, sell and assign it, and hold up the taxpayers of these States.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. If the gentleman wishes, I would agree to an amendment to strike out section 2.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How many amendments are you going to have to this bill? I am not going to let it go through.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will ask the gentleman if the work of construction in connection with this bridge is now proceeding.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. It is. May I remind the gentleman from New York that the bill granting the right to construct this bridge was enacted in 1928. The bridge company, which is made up almost entirely of citizens at Wabasha, Minn., and vicinity, has already sold nearly \$500,000 worth of shares in their bridge.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They have sold shares?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. To local people.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of stock?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. To local people; yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And not bonds?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Shares of stock.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is all the more reason why I am going to object.

Mr. STAFFORD. To my mind that is all the more reason for the construction of this bridge, because it is local capital that is seeking to provide a convenience for the benefit of the locality.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. If a right of way is not granted one end of the bridge will be in river-bottom lands and the other end in the city. You are not protecting anyone by making objection to it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word on this bill and reserve the right to object. It is proposed to give to a corporation, its successors and assigns, a right of way 200 feet in width over any lands—"any lands"—of the United States reserved or acquired for the purposes of the upper Mississippi River wild life and fish refuge, and extending between the eastern and western boundaries of said refuge, "along such course as may be suitable upon the final location of the bridge." Now, the report says a toll bridge is already under construction. And I should suppose from that language that the location of the bridge has already been definitely fixed, and therefore I do not understand what that provision in the bill means—"200 feet wide over any lands" on that reservation extending between the eastern and western boundaries of said refuge as may be suitable "upon the final location of the bridge."

The bill does not say how long that right of way is to be, nor does it say anything else about it, except that it is to be 200 feet wide.

There is another provision to which I am opposed and to which attention has been called by the gentleman from Michigan.

Such right of way shall not be used, except by permission of the Secretary of Agriculture, for any purpose other than the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge.

In other words, the bill proposes to have the use to which this strip through this game and fish preserve may be put, left entirely to the discretion of a Secretary of Agriculture, a political appointee. I am not referring to any individual, but I have in mind right now Secretaries of the Interior who leased Teapot Dome.

This refuge is the property of the people of the United States. We are trustees for them. They are our *cestui que trust*; and for us to turn over to a Secretary of Agriculture the right to lease for any length of time, in his discretion, and to any person or corporation, a strip 200 feet in width in a national game refuge preserve, is something that I can not consent to.

Moreover, suppose he leases it for eight years?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. If the gentleman will permit, the Secretary of Agriculture is not given the power to lease it. It only states under what conditions it may be used.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He could, by the bill, give them permission to use it for any length of time and for any purpose, in his discretion.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Will the gentleman be satisfied if we strike out that section?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would not be satisfied with any bill of this character, when the House is asked to pass it by unanimous consent, and I object.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ARMY AND NAVY HOSPITAL AT HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6124) to provide for the reconstruction of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas renews his request for the present consideration of House bill 6124, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I understand the gentleman from Arkansas has agreed with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] that a proviso shall be inserted at the end of the bill.

Mr. GLOVER. I accept that amendment, and also an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed (1) to raze the buildings constituting the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; (2) to construct on such site a sanitary, fireproof hospital with a capacity of approximately 500 beds, and to install therein necessary heating and ventilating apparatus, furniture, equipment, and accessories; and (3) to build necessary roads leading to such hospital.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,800,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all of line 3 and down to and including line 10 on page 1, and all of lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 2, and insert:

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to raze such part of the existing hospital buildings in the reservation of the Army and Navy General Hospital, at Hot Springs, Ark., as may be desirable and proper to make room for the construction of another hospital, and thereafter to construct upon said ground such additional unit of said Army and Navy General Hospital, at Hot Springs, Ark., and for said purpose there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$450,000 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"SEC. 2. All funds expended for the construction or reconstruction of hospital buildings and facilities on said Army and Navy General Hospital Reservation, at Hot Springs, Ark., authorized by this or any other act, shall be so expended under supervision of the Secretary of War, and the said hospital shall remain under the jurisdiction and control of the War Department."

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McSWAIN to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 12, after "\$450,000," insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HOOPER: Page 2, line 20, after the word "Department," strike out the period, insert a comma and the words "Provided, That the exterior design of said hospital shall be approved by the National Park Service."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PECATONICA RIVER NEAR ROCKFORD, ILL.

Mr. BUCKBEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, because of an emergency, for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11779) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pecatonica River northwest of Rockford, Ill., in section 5, township 27 north, range 11 east, fourth principal meridian.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 11779, and states it is a matter of emergency. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Pecatonica River, northwest of Rockford, Ill., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in section 5, township 27 north, range 11 east, fourth principal meridian, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ALLEGHENY RIVER AT OR NEAR OLEAN, N. Y.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11703) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Olean, N. Y., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Olean, N. Y. This is a matter of emergency.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 11703, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Olean, N. Y., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Allegheny River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Olean, Cattaraugus County, N. Y., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to be assured that the member of the committee reporting the bill will not offer an amendment to make this a toll bridge after we have passed the unanimous-consent stage, as was done yesterday.

Mr. REED of New York. I will guarantee that. The gentleman need not worry about that at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1931

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7491) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska calls up the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7491) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10, 24, 25, 33, 34, 40, and 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 48, 49, and 50, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,277,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,496,786"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$488,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the acceptance of a donation of land and the construction thereon of suitable buildings and appurtenances for the forest products laboratory, and for other purposes,' approved April 15, 1930, \$100,000; and in addition thereto the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into contracts or otherwise to incur obligations for the purposes of such act in amounts not exceeding \$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,066,230"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$15,859,230"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$397,474"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,593,204"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$59,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,322,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,818,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For an additional amount for the control, the prevention of the spread, and eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly, the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, investigations, printing, and the maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles outside of the District of Columbia, \$1,740,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That in addition to the foregoing sum there is authorized to be transferred from other appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1931 such sum or sums, not exceeding in the aggregate \$1,500,000, to be used as an emergency reserve fund for the further purposes of this paragraph, and to be released for expenditure when, in the judgment of the President of the United States, the intensity and/or distribution of infestation of the Mediterranean fruit fly render such action necessary: *Provided further*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture no expenditure shall be made hereunder until a sum or sums adequate to State cooperation shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities or individuals or organizations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,448,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "and for the erection of a laboratory building in the District of Columbia or elsewhere for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Bureau of Public Roads, and for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, gift, grant, dedication, or otherwise, of such lands as he may deem necessary to provide a suitable site for such laboratory not to exceed \$300,000, to be paid from the administrative funds authorized by the act approved November 9, 1921, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, appropriated herein. On and after the passage of this act the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$75,000 made by the act approved March 4, 1917 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 39, p. 1161), for such a laboratory on the Arlington farm property of the United States Department of Agriculture shall cease to be available and shall be covered into the Treasury"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$155,397,770"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ROBT. G. SIMMONS,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
JOHN N. SANDELL,

Managers on the part of the House.

CHAS. L. McNARY,
W. L. JONES,
HENRY W. KEYES,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
WM. J. HARRIS,
JOHN B. KENDRICK,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7491) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon

and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Retains the Senate language making available for the fiscal year 1931 the unexpended balance of the appropriation for rent of buildings for the department for the fiscal year 1930.

WEATHER BUREAU

On No. 2: Appropriates \$10,000, as provided by the Senate, for extending horticultural frost warning service in the West.

On No. 3: Appropriates \$30,000, as provided by the Senate, for expansion of weather reporting service to include data on ceiling and visibility conditions for the benefit of commercial aviation.

On No. 4: Corrects a total.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

On No. 5: Increases the allotment for construction of buildings under the Bureau of Dairy Industry in the sum of \$5,000, to care for the construction of a dairy barn at Mandan, N. Dak.

On Nos. 6 and 7: Corrects a title.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

On No. 8: Appropriates \$20,000, as provided by the Senate, for study of culture of sea-island cotton, development of a seed supply for same, etc.

On No. 9: Appropriates \$140,000, as provided by the House, instead of \$160,000, as provided by the Senate, for studies of rubber, fiber, and other tropical plants.

On No. 10: Strikes out the appropriation of \$12,500, as provided by the Senate, for studies in the culture of Turkish tobacco.

On No. 11: Retains the increase of \$5,000, as provided by the Senate, in the appropriation for speeding up the testing of sugar-cane varieties for adaptation to conditions in Louisiana.

On No. 12: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$5,000 for date-growing studies, and strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$5,000 for studies of the diseases of cabbages and onions.

On No. 13: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$20,000 for the study of acid tolerant leguminous crops in the Southeastern States.

On Nos. 14 and 15: Corrects the total of the bureau appropriation and adjusts the amount available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

FOREST SERVICE

On No. 16: Corrects the spelling of a word.

On No. 17: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$10,500 for the study of southern hardwoods and \$5,000 for horticultural research work in northern Georgia.

On No. 18: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$15,000 for investigations at Madison (Wis.) Forest Products Laboratory of pulp possibilities of softwoods.

On No. 19: Appropriates \$100,000, together with authority to obligate in the additional sum of \$800,000, for new buildings at the forest products laboratory at Madison, Wis., as provided by the House, instead of a direct appropriation of \$900,000 for such purposes, as provided by the Senate.

On No. 20: Appropriates \$50,000, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$25,000, as provided by the House, for investigations in forest economics.

On No. 21: Corrects a total.

On No. 22: Corrects a citation of a statute.

On No. 23: Corrects a total.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS

On No. 24: Restores the House appropriation of \$25,000, stricken out by the Senate, for the establishment of a soil erosion station in the Pacific Northwest.

On No. 25: Corrects a total.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

On No. 26: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$5,000 for pea-weevil investigations and strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$3,800 for investigations of the bean beetle in New Mexico.

On No. 27: Retains the Senate increase of \$10,000 in the appropriation for developing sugarcane-borer parasites.

On No. 28: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$10,000 for mosquito investigations in the Columbia River Valley.

On No. 29: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$5,000 for insect pests of confections and nut meats.

On No. 30: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$7,500 for apiary investigations in Pacific Coast States and \$3,100 for bee-keeping studies.

On No. 31: Corrects a total.

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

On No. 32: Strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$5,000 for purchase of animals at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., fur-bearing animal station and retains the Senate appropriation of \$2,000

for the study of the diseases of fur-bearing animals at that station.

On No. 33: Strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$4,157 for laboratory work in identification of birds and mammals collected by the Biological Survey and cooperating scientific agencies.

On No. 34: Strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$40,000 for investigations concerning destruction of young wild ducks by predatory animals.

On No. 35: Appropriates \$40,000, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$15,000, as provided by the House, for the establishment of a musk-oxen industry in Alaska.

On No. 36: Corrects a total.

On Nos. 37 and 38: Corrects a title.

On Nos. 39 and 40: Corrects a total and adjusts the amount available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

On No. 41: Appropriates \$70,000, as provided by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as provided by the House, for tobacco grading.

On No. 42: Retains the Senate appropriation of \$10,000 for extension of market news service to the Oregon State College of Agriculture.

On No. 43: Corrects a total.

On Nos. 44 and 45: Corrects a total and adjusts the amount available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

PLANT QUARANTINE AND CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

On No. 46, relating to the Mediterranean fruit fly: Appropriates \$1,740,000 for control, prevention, and eradication work, and authorizes the President to transfer not to exceed \$1,500,000 from other appropriations available to the department during the fiscal year 1931 and to release the same for expenditure when, in his judgment, the intensity and/or distribution of infestation of the fly renders such action necessary in lieu of a direct appropriation of \$6,900,000 for such purposes, as provided by the Senate.

On No. 47: Corrects a total.

MISCELLANEOUS

On No. 48: Corrects a title.

On No. 49: Corrects the spelling of a word.

On No. 50: Corrects the citation of a statute.

On No. 51: Restores the provision, stricken out by the Senate, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expend not to exceed \$300,000 out of administrative funds authorized by the Federal highway act approved November 9, 1921, as amended, for the erection of a laboratory building in the District of Columbia or elsewhere for permanent quarters for the testing and research work of the Bureau of Public Roads, and for the acquisition of a site therefor, in modified language, confining the authorization to the funds appropriated in this bill.

On No. 52: Strikes out the Senate appropriation of \$805,561 for the restoration of Federal-aid roads in South Carolina damaged by floods.

On No. 53: Corrects the total of the bill.

ROBT. G. SIMMONS,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
JOHN N. SANDLIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

MR. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I was startled, surprised, and shocked to hear in this report that we are providing \$1,700,000 for the further eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly in Florida. I had the impression that it did not now exist. We sent a committee down there, of which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] was a member, and I understood from that committee that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] and others went over the State with a magnifying glass and they could not find a fly.

MR. SIMMONS. The statement of the gentleman from New York is correct, we found no flies. Last August the Agricultural Department was asking for \$26,000,000 for this purpose, and at the time that we went down there they asked in excess of \$15,000,000. After we came back they asked for \$6,000,000, and we are now down to \$1,700,000, which will enable them to carry on the work, keep up the quarantine work, and absolve the Government from any further claim. I think we have justified our trip to Florida.

MR. LAGUARDIA. That may be so; but is there any danger that a part of this money will be used to breed new flies to justify an appropriation next time? [Laughter.]

MR. SIMMONS. I do not think so. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

THE FEDERAL FARM BOARD

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] inserted in the RECORD a statement of Mr. Marsh, of the University of Nebraska, regarding the Federal Farm Board. Later the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] inserted a statement by Governor McKelvey answering the statement. Due to the fact that these two statements are in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting two letters from the secretary of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two letters written by C. B. Steward, secretary Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, to John R. Webster, president board of regents, University of Nebraska, regarding the Federal Farm Board.

The letters are as follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR., May 15, 1930.

Mr. JOHN L. WEBSTER,

President Board of Regents, University of Nebraska,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing a clipping from the Grain Dealers' Journal, issue of April 23, of a paid advertisement purporting to be signed by Mr. Fred A. Marsh, a regent of the University of Nebraska. This advertisement signed by a regent of the university first appeared in the Central City Republican, issue of April 3, 1930. It appeared there as a full-page advertisement. Reprints of this full-page advertisement were mailed broadcast throughout Nebraska by a mailing bureau in Omaha. For your information, I wish to say that this is only one of a series of similar advertisements appearing in the same paper each week, signed by different men, all of the same general nature, and all mailed out by the mailing bureau in Omaha.

I wish to direct your attention to the fact that Mr. Marsh is using his position as a regent of the university for its publicity value in attacking the Farm Board and indirectly the cooperative-marketing movement among farmers. The significant thing is that these attacks all appear originally in the Central City Republican, and that some of the men who sign them, while they advertise themselves to be farmers, are in reality stool pigeons of the Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association.

The Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association has been a bitter foe of farmers' cooperative organizations ever since the beginning of this movement 25 years ago. I wish to say that I concede that Mr. Marsh has a right to his opinions, and if he wished to fight the battles of the Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association, he has a right to do so, but as a Nebraska farmer and a representative of Nebraska farmers' organizations I wish to protest against the use by Mr. Marsh of his position as a regent of the University of Nebraska to secure publicity and act as a cat's-paw for the enemies of the farmers' cooperative movement in Nebraska—the Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association.

Nebraska is preeminently an agricultural State. The support of our university comes very largely directly or indirectly in the form of taxes paid by agriculture. In addition to that, I wish to point out that the university derives considerable financial support from the Federal Government, and that this financial support is included in the appropriation made for the Department of Agriculture and is expended by the Department of Agriculture, of which the Secretary, a Cabinet member, is also a member of the Farm Board which Mr. Marsh is criticizing. Now, of course, we have very good reason to believe that the advertisement attacking the Farm Board and cooperative marketing which Mr. Marsh signed as a regent of the university was inspired by the Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association, and that they paid for the advertisement and for its distribution. Will Mr. Marsh on his honor say that this was original with him and that he bore the expense?

You know it just happens that Central City is the headquarters of the Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association and that Mr. T. B. King, secretary and manager of the T. B. Hord Grain Co., is also the president of the Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association. I am very sorry indeed that a regent of the university would so far belittle the high position which he occupies by making use of that office in order to spread propaganda detrimental to the interests of the cooperative movement among farmers in Nebraska, and I especially condemn it because Mr. Marsh was represented to be the farmer representative on the board of regents for his district. Certainly he has acted in a very unethical and reprehensible manner in permitting his position as a regent of the university to be used for such a contemptible purpose.

I hope you will bring this matter to the attention of the board of regents at the next regular meeting of the board, and that the board will see fit to officially place its stamp of disapproval upon such a use of the high position of a regent of the University of Nebraska. Otherwise the just criticism of farmers may be leveled at the board of

regents as a whole. In my opinion, Mr. Marsh should relieve the board of regents of the University of Nebraska of such an embarrassing situation as has come about because of his unwise actions by immediately resigning from the board, as he certainly has proven unfaithful to the interests which he was supposed to represent.

Very truly yours,

C. B. STEWARD, Secretary.

LINCOLN, NEBR., May 16, 1930.

Mr. JOHN R. WEBSTER,

President Board of Regents, University of Nebraska,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the Omaha-World Herald the statement of Mr. Fred A. Marsh, regent of the university, in defense of his action in assisting the organized grain dealers in their opposition to the Farm Board and to the cooperative efforts of farmers to market the products which they produce.

Mr. Marsh says he did not approve of the use of his title as a regent of the university in the statement which appeared over his name and which he admits he did not prepare or mail out. May I suggest that we need men on our board of regents who think for themselves and do not depend upon somebody else to do their thinking for them. I want to point out further that Mr. Marsh's statement was first made in the Central City Republican on April 3. This statement was later reprinted and broadcasted over the State over his signature as a regent and later was printed again as an advertisement in the Grain Dealers Journal on April 23. It looks as though Regent Marsh had not made a very strong effort to prohibit the use of his title as a regent of the university. In fact, there does not seem to be any statement from him disclaiming the unwarranted use of his official position until he has been publicly condemned for his unethical conduct.

I have no doubt that Mr. Marsh is justified in saying that so far as he knows the persons who signed these advertisements to which I referred are farmers and not connected with the Nebraska Grain Dealers' Association. I accept his statement as correct and retract that part of my statement. I do not change my position that Mr. Marsh and these others have been induced to assist the organized grain dealers in their battle to crush the development of the cooperative marketing principle among farmers. The issue is clearly drawn and Mr. Marsh has chosen to align himself with the enemies of cooperative marketing.

He expresses great sympathy for the grain dealers, but he has never raised his voice in sympathy of the thousands of farmers who, because of the postwar deflation, have lost their homes and the savings of a lifetime. He seems to be of the same opinion as the grain dealers of Minneapolis that "the farmers should go home and slop the hogs," leaving the marketing of his products to the favored interests who have grown wealthy at the expense of the producer class who have seen the value of their property steadily depreciate because of its low earning ability. I am very glad indeed that Mr. Marsh has publicly acknowledged his alignment with the enemies of farmers' cooperative marketing associations. When he was elected a member of the board of regents it was thought that he was properly classed as a representative of farmers, but we now find we are mistaken and that it was just another case of fooling the farmer. We regret very much that a member of the board of regents should lose sight of the great responsibilities of his position to the extent that he would permit selfish interests to exploit the influence of that position in order to spread this propaganda against cooperative marketing. In my opinion, Mr. Marsh's explanation only puts him deeper in the mire.

Very truly yours,

C. B. STEWARD, Secretary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. SIROVICH, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. REECE, for three days, on account of private business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1234. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels;

H. R. 8574. An act to transfer to the Attorney General certain functions in the administration of the national prohibition act, to create a bureau of prohibition in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9843. An act to enable the Secretary of War to accomplish the construction of approaches and surroundings, together with the necessary adjacent roadways, to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va.;

H. R. 10340. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark.; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of medals to the officers and men of the Byrd Antarctic expedition. The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 180. An act to legalize a bridge across St. Johns River 2½ miles southerly of Green Cove Springs, Fla.;

S. 548. An act for the relief of retired and transferred members of the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 3741. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the South Fork of the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

S. 3742. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

S. 3743. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Canton, Ky.;

S. 3744. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Eggners Ferry, Ky.;

S. 3783. An act for the relief of the State of Georgia for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929; and

S. 4119. An act to extend the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 43, sec. 1171), as amended, to coal lands in Alabama.

ADJOURNMENT

And then, on motion of Mr. TILSON (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, May 21, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Second deficiency bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(10.30 a. m.)

To prohibit experiments on living dogs in the District of Columbia, and providing a penalty for violation thereof (H. R. 7884).

To authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia (H. J. Res. 159).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the Government of the United States, a lighter-than-air base near Sunnyvale, in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, and construct necessary improvements thereon (H. R. 6810).

Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept a free site for a lighter-than-air base at Camp Kearny, near San Diego, Calif., and construct necessary improvements thereon (H. R. 6808).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

477. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay claims and causes of actions which have been settled by them under the provisions of an act authorizing the commissioners to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia amounting to \$98,242.09 (H. Doc. No. 406); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

478. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1931, in the sum of \$20,800 (H. Doc. No. 407); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

479. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the Legislative Establishment, amounting to

\$404,190.68 (H. Doc. No. 408); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

480. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the George Washington Bicentennial Commission for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$364,875, in lieu of the estimate of \$148,200 on April 10, 1930 (H. Doc. No. 409); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12263. A bill to authorize the acquisition of 1,000 acres of land, more or less, for aerial bombing range purposes at Kelly Field, Tex., and in settlement of certain damage claims; with amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3810. An act to provide for the commemoration of the termination of the War between the States at Appomattox Court House, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MERRITT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12231. A bill authorizing the exchange of certain real properties situated in Mobile, Ala., between the Secretary of Commerce on behalf of the United States Government and the Gulf, Mobile & Northern Railroad Co., by the appropriate conveyances containing certain conditions and reservations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BROWNE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 333. A joint resolution to authorize an appropriation of \$10,000 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Ninth International Dairy Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1931; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12284. A bill to provide for the construction of vessels for the Coast Guard for rescue and assistance work on Lake Erie; without amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2215. A bill for the relief of Fireman's Fund Insurance Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5523. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. K. Root; with amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5926. A bill for the relief of Lillian N. Lakin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8607. A bill for the relief of Frank Bayer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9199. A bill for the relief of John F. Williams and Anderson Tyler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9215. A bill for the relief of Jessie Axton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 416. A bill to equalize the basis of longevity pay and retirement of Warrant Officer Edward F. McCarron, United States Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4084. A bill for the relief of the United States Bank of St. Louis, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12421) granting a pension to Ella Ellis, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 12479) to coordinate the agricultural experiment station work and to extend the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 12480) to amend an act to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefor, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commission merchants and others, and to require them to truly and correctly account therefor, same being known as the produce agency act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 12481) to promote agricultural progress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 12482) to relieve unemployment, to protect American labor, to encourage industry and regulate commerce with foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12483) to provide for moral and humane education in the public schools in the District of Columbia, and to prohibit practices inimical thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12484) to amend the act approved February 28, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a municipal center in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12485) authorizing the construction and equipment of a United States Veterans' Bureau hospital in the first congressional district of Oklahoma; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12486) to designate streets to be known as Memorial Boulevard; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 12487) to amend the naturalization laws in respect of residence requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 12488) to provide for the regulation of tolls over certain bridges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 12489) to provide for the enforcement of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906, as amended, and the Lacey Act, approved May 25, 1900, as amended, regulating interstate or foreign commerce in wild animals and birds, or parts thereof, and for the protection of employees of the Department of Agriculture in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 12490) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 12491) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12492) granting a pension to David W. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 12493) granting a pension to Emma Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12494) granting a pension to Mattie Grover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12495) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Mosler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12496) for the relief of Hermie Frederick; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 12497) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 12498) for the relief of the Port Arthur Canal & Dock Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 12499) for the relief of Charles H. Early; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12500) for the relief of Charles H. Earl; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 12501) granting an increase of pension to Mary Kern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 12502) granting a pension to Gellgoe Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 12503) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Fred E. Bury; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 12504) for the relief of Theodore W. Beland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 12505) for the relief of Catherine L. Merrill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 12506) for the relief of H. E. Hurley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12507) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Dunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 12508) for the relief of Claude Cyril Langley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 12509) for the relief of Charles J. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 12510) granting a pension to Mabel F. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOOP: A bill (H. R. 12511) granting a pension to Emma J. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 12512) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Brazelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 12513) granting an increase of pension to Jerusha Tuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12514) granting a pension to Mary Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 12515) granting a pension to Zerah M. Bridges; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12516) granting increase of pension to Mary G. Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12517) granting an increase in pension to Rhoda Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12518) granting an increase in pension to Mary T. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 12519) granting an increase of pension to Alzina Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12520) granting a pension to Mary E. Barnheisel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7322. By Mr. BLACKBURN: Memorial of Baptist Women's Missionary Society of the Davids Fork Church, Chilesburg, Ky., signed by Krille Ware, president, and Lula Gahagan, secretary, memorializing Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of the production and distribution of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7323. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Peterson, Iowa, urging that Congress enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7324. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of many citizens of the Philippine Islands, favoring the passage of House bill 8371; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7325. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of the committee on foreign and insular trade, New York Board of Trade (Inc.), indorsing Senate bill 2627, to provide for the extension of the life of the passport and the reduction of the fee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7326. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition signed by the president, Mrs. F. F. Yapp, and the secretary, Mrs. Ida F. Mitchell, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waterloo, Iowa, which represents a large number of women, urging the passage of legislation for the Federal supervision of motion-picture films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7327. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Hennepin County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging the establishment of a Department of Labor employment service to be located in the Twin Cities of Minnesota; to the Committee on Labor.

7328. By Mr. STONE: Petition of Quincey M. Rusco and wives of letter carriers of Stillwater, Okla., in support of House bill 6603, 44-hour week bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7329. By Mr. WALKER: Petition of Eloise P. Green, of Berea, Ky., favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures to establish higher standards in that industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7330. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Merrett Storr, 1300 Westmunster Building, 110 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 6147; to the Committee on the Library.

7331. Also, petition of Lincoln Letter Co., 205 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of the proposed 2½-cent rate on first-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7332. Also, petition of Mr. H. E. Schoefield, 8817 Throop Street, Chicago, Ill., and 25 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage of House bill 10821; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7333. Also, petition of Rumford Chemical Works, East St. Louis, Ill., protesting against Senate bill 3060, creating a Federal bureau of employment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7334. Also, petition of B. Heller & Co., Calumet Avenue and Fortieth Street, Chicago, Ill., urging defeat of Senate bill 3060; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, May 21, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou ruler of the nations, who hast called us to share with Thee in the order and government of the world, bring us now through quiet prayer into the spirit from which shall flow some streams of service for the Nation's weal as light streams from the stars. Pardon our shortcomings, our instability of purpose, our proneness to decline from vivid aspiration to the dullness of content, and grant us such clear-mindedness, such passion for the reign of righteousness that what we greatly think we shall ever nobly dare. And when we talk with our past hours in spirit walks of days deceased, speak Thou with us, that we may know that life is long which answers life's great end. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 428. An act to authorize the transfer of the former naval radio station, Seawall, Me., as an addition to the Acadia National Park;

S. 3185. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy;

S. 3585. An act to eliminate certain land from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., as an addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation; and

S. 3817. An act to facilitate and simplify national-forest administration.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7491) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 320) authorizing reconstruction and improvement of a public road in Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 3934. An act granting certain lands to the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan; and

S. 4182. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Georgetown, S. C., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4020. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the advisability and practicability of establishing a national park to be known as

the Upper Mississippi National Park in the States of Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota;

H. R. 5190. An act to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service;

H. R. 6124. An act to provide for the reconstruction of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 7924. An act for the erection of tablets or markers and the commemoration of Camp Blount and the Old Stone Bridge, Lincoln County, Tenn.;

H. R. 9300. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hire vehicles from village delivery carriers;

H. R. 9370. An act to provide for the modernization of the United States Naval Observatory at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9707. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring public-utility properties, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10082. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Cincinnati, Ohio;

H. R. 10780. An act to transfer certain lands to the Ouachita National Forest, Ark.;

H. R. 11007. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, par. 7, 37 Stat. 556; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 631), making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913;

H. R. 11433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for the Library of Congress, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1928, relating to the condemnation of land;

H. R. 11679. To extend hospital facilities to certain retired officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11703. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Olean, N. Y., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Olean, N. Y.;

H. R. 11779. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pecatonica River northwest of Rockford, Ill., in section 5, township 27 north, range 11 east, fourth principal meridian;

H. R. 12447. An act to extend hospital facilities to certain retired officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service and to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service;

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to provide for the expenses of a delegation of the United States to the sixth meeting of the Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Budapest in 1931;

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union; and

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 180. An act to legalize a bridge across St. Johns River 2½ miles southerly of Green Cove Springs, Fla.;

S. 548. An act for the relief of retired and transferred members of the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 3741. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the South Fork of the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

S. 3742. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

S. 3743. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Canton, Ky.;

S. 3744. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Eggners Ferry, Ky.;

S. 3783. An act for the relief of the State of Georgia for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929;

S. 4119. An act to extend the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 43, sec. 1171), as amended, to coal lands in Alabama;

H. R. 185. An act to amend section 180, title 28, United States Code, as amended;